

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI

August 1918

NUMBER 4

THE INFERNAL COUNCIL

The purpose of this study is to trace the development of the "Infernal Council" from Claudian and the Gospel of Nicodemus, through Robert de Boron, Boccaccio, Sannazaro, Vida, and Tasso, to Milton.¹

I

At the end of the fourth century of our era, Claudian composed two Latin poems, *In Rufinum* and *De Raptu Proserpinae*, which had a very great influence upon later writers, especially because of the descriptions of councils in Hell with which they begin. The *In Rufinum* was intended both as an invective against Rufinus, the ambitious minister of Arcadius, Emperor of the East, and as a bit of flattery for the Western Emperor and for his general Stilicho. Rufinus is represented as an envoy of Hell, the monsters of which have sat in solemn conclave and determined that the world is too happy. As war on Heaven seems likely to prove disastrous, it is resolved to accept the suggestion of Megaera, to send her foster-child Rufinus to wreak ruin among men.²

The opening scene in *De Raptu Proserpinae* is likewise an infernal council, called this time by Pluto, who is enraged because he is

¹ Professor E. H. Wilkins, now of the University of Chicago, suggested this subject to me some years ago, when I was under his instruction at Harvard University. While Professor Wilkins has been helpful in many ways in the assembling of the materials for this article, he is in no sense responsible for the conclusions reached.

² See T. R. Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, Cambridge, 1901, p. 220.

unmarried.¹ The upshot of the argument is that Ceres, scenting disaster, hides her beautiful child Proserpine in Sicily. As soon as Pluto voices his complaint, Lachesis begs him not to run the risk of waging war on Heaven. "Ask Jupiter, and a wife will be given," she pleads. Then Maia brings her son Mercury before him. Pluto, seated on his horrible but majestic throne, speaks to his winged messenger, railing against his brother Jupiter, who, he declares, not satisfied with excluding him from the light of day, has hindered him from procuring a spouse.

There were numerous models for Claudian's infernal councils in earlier poetry, such as the council of the gods in the *Aeneid* x. Nevertheless, much as Claudian owed to Virgil,² in the *De Raptu Proserpinae* he appears to have imitated especially the beautiful Homeric hymn to Demeter.³ The council of the gods summoned by Jupiter, described in the Greek poem, became the infernal council in the Latin imitation, a change which had many parallels in the later history of the subject.⁴

Attention is called to the following passages from the *In Rufinum* and the *De Raptu Proserpinae* which were imitated, as we shall see, by later writers:

Invidiae quondam stimulis incanduit atrox
 Alecto, placidas late cum cerneret urbes.
 Protinus infernas ad limina taetra sorores,
 Concilium deforme, vocat. Glomerantur in unum
 Innumerae pestes Erebi, quascumque sinistro
 Nox genuit fetu: Nutrix Discordia belli,
 Imperiosa Fames, leto vicina Senectus
 Impatiensque sui Morbus Livorque secundis
 Anxius et scisso maerens velamine Luctus
 Et Timor et caeco praeceps Audacia vultu
 Et Luxus populator opum, quem semper adhaerens
 Infelix humili gressu comitatur Egestas,
 Foedaque Avaritiae complexae pectora matris
 Insomnes longo veniunt examine Curae.
 Complentur vario ferrata sedilia coetu
 Torvaque collectis stipatur curia monstris.

¹ See T. R. Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, Cambridge, 1901, p. 244.

² *Ibid.*, p. 233.

³ *Vss.* 313 ff.

⁴ See L. Cerrato, "De Claudii Claudiani fontibus in poemate de Raptu Proserpinae," in *Rivista di Filologia*, Turin, IX (1881), 278.

Alecto stetit in mediis vulgusque tacere
Iussit et obstantes in tergum reppulit angues
Perque umeros errare dedit.¹

At nos indecores longo torpebimus aevo
Omnibus eiectae regnis?²

Iam quaecumque latent ferali monstra barathro
In turmas aciemque ruunt, contraque Tonantem
Coniurant Furiae, crinitaque sontibus hydrys
Tisiphone quatiens infausto lumine pinum
Armatus ad castra vocat pallentia manes.³

. . . . Tunc talia celso
Ore tonat—tremefacta silent dicente tyranno
Atria, latratum triplicem compescuit ingens
Ianitor et presso lacrimarum fonte resedit
Coeytos tacitisque Acheron obmutuit undis
Et Phlegethontae requierunt murmura ripae.⁴

. . . . Tantumne tibi saevissime frater
In me iuris erit? Sic nobis noxia vires
Cum caelo Fortuna tulit? Num robur et arma
Perdidimus, si rapta dies? An forte iacentes
Ignavosque putas, quod non Cyclopia tela
Stringimus aut vacuas tonitru deludimus auras?
Nonne satis visum, quod grati luminis expers
Tertia supremæ patior dispendia sortis
Informesque plagas, cum te laetissimus ornet
Signifer et vario cingant splendore Triones?⁵

II

We may consider Claudian, despite his possible familiarity with the Scriptures,⁶ as the chief source of a *pagan* tradition in descriptions of infernal councils. For a *Christian* tradition, let us examine the so-called gospel of Nicodemus, which, according to Gaston Paris and Alphonse Bos, is really based on two Greek manuscripts, united

¹ *In Rufinum*, I, 25-43. I quote from *C. Claudiani Carmina*, ed. Jeep, Leipzig, 1876.

² *Ibid.*, 58, 59.

³ *De Raptu Proserpinae*, I, 37-41.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 83-88.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 93-102.

⁶ See Glover, p. 242.

by a certain Ananias or Aeneas in 425.¹ The first of these manuscripts, which is the Gospel of Nicodemus proper, is of little interest to us, being intended merely to give information on the passion of Christ supplementary to what is found in the New Testament. It is the second manuscript which contains an infernal council. This manuscript itself goes back to a manuscript of gnostic origin of the first half of the third century, the Greek form of which is anterior to the middle of the fourth century. It relates the descent of Christ into Hell, his victories over Hades and Satan, and the baptism of sinners. At considerable length an infernal council held over Christ's prospective entrance into the lower world is described. Satan tells Hades of the miracles accomplished by Christ, who comes as an all-powerful invader to take back the captives.

Probably about the end of the fifth century, the manuscript of Ananias or Aeneas was translated into Latin. The Latin translation was in turn rendered into French about the beginning of the thirteenth century by André de Coutances; also by a so-called Chrétien (first half of the thirteenth century); and by an anonymous author in the fourteenth century (MS C in the Paris-Bos edition). The account of the infernal council, in the French version, continues through several hundred lines.

III

At the beginning of his *Merlin*, Robert de Boron inserted an infernal council. As a result of this council, Merlin is brought into the world, born of a virgin, but, unfortunately for the devils, so innocent that he turns all his power for harm to a good purpose. In the *Merlin*, however, the time of the council is set later than in the *Nicodème*. Christ has already entered Hell; Adam, Eve, and the other captives have been released; and humanity has been safeguarded through baptism from the deceits of the evil one. The devils rehearse their grievances, such as their exclusion from Heaven, and the diminishing number of their victims, and determine to obtain their revenge by creating an anti-Christ to combat the saving doctrines of Christianity. Robert de Boron reduces the entire description of the council to three pages. Yet, despite so much abridgement,

¹ *L'Évangile de Nicodème*, ed. Paris and Bos, Paris: Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1885, pp. II and III.

there is often a pretty close textual resemblance between the *Merlin* and the *Nicodème*.¹

Note in particular the following passages in the *Merlin*, which were imitated by later writers:

Qui est chis hom qui nous a enforchiés et nos ferm(et)és brisies si que nule chose que nous eussions reposte ne pot estre celee encontre lui (et) que il n'ait fait trestout chou que il lui plaist ?²

Et nous alames, si presimes ichiaus qui che disoient que cil qui lors verroit en terre les deliverroit des painnes d'infer. . . . Si nous a tolu chou que nous avons perdu et chou que nous aviens saisi, que nous n'i poo(n)s riens prendre contre lui.³

Ore les avons tous perdus par le lavement que il font, si que nous n'avons nul poir sour iaus dessi que il revignent (a nous) par oeuvres que il font.⁴

Et plus encore, que il (a) laissié menistres en terre qui les sauveront, ja n'averont tant fait de nos oeuvres, se il s'en voelent repentir et nos oeuvres guerpier et faire chou que li menistre lour diront.⁵

Cil qui plus nous ont neut, che sont cil qui (plus) di(s)ent de sa venue en terre.⁶

Il i a tel de nous qui bien puet prendre samblance d'omme et conchevoir en feme.⁷

IV

Boccaccio, in his *Filocolo*, follows on the whole the narrative of the *Cantare di Fiorio e di Biancifiore*,⁸ which is probably itself derived from a French source. Nevertheless, not satisfied with what he contemptuously calls the "fabulosi parlari degli ignoranti,"⁹ he undertakes to lend to the simple tale of *Fleur et Blanchefleur* a grandiose significance. To that end, he borrows heavily from classical mythology and from the Scriptures, and even attempts to impose an epic

¹ *Merlin*, ed. Paris and Ulrich, Paris, Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1886, Introduction. Cf. *Nicodème*, ed. cit., loc. cit.

² *Merlin*, p. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Ed. Crescini, Bologna, 1889-99, Vol. I, p. 462.

⁹ *Filocolo*, Vol. I (=Boccaccio, *Opere volgari*, Vol. VII), Florence, 1829, p. 7.

form upon his narrative.¹ For such an ambitious project, what better material could he find than the Biblical story of the tragic fall of o'erweening Satan, and of the creation and temptation of man? Boccaccio's predilection for scriptural matter leads him to introduce this epic narrative at least three times into the *Filocolo*. Let us call these three accounts, for convenience, A, B, and C.²

In A, after promising to tell the story of Florio and Biancofiore, Boccaccio suddenly relates the conflict between Jupiter and Pluto. Jupiter drove Pluto out of Heaven for his ambition, and assigned to him and to his followers the dismal kingdom of Dis. The empty seats of the fallen angels were filled with a new generation, of whom Adam and Eve were the parents. Pluto succeeded in tempting man to sin, thus driving him out of Eden "alle sue case." Jupiter then sent his son to liberate the men who were imprisoned in Dis, and also to provide them with arms so that they might defend themselves against the snares of Pluto. So effective were these weapons, that it was impossible for Pluto's forces to resist them.

At this point, the mission of St. James to Spain is suddenly introduced. Then, for a few pages, Boccaccio practically follows the *Cantare*. However, when he comes to describe Lelio's preparations for an expedition to the shrine of St. James in fulfillment of a vow, Boccaccio returns to his epic theme. He depicts Pluto as being so greatly agitated over the expedition of Lelio that he holds an infernal council over the matter. It is there decided that Pluto, disguising himself as the governor of Marmorina, is to prevent the expedition by "la paura."

In B, which is the infernal council proper, the events related in A are recited as grievances—in somewhat more summary style. There remains C, where much of the matter in A and B is recited by Ilario, as the preface to the scriptural lessons which he imparts to Florio.

Boccaccio, in narrating briefly the conspiracy of devils enraged at the victories of Christ, naturally owes little to classical sources. We may even suspect that some of his paraphernalia of proper names was taken not from Latin authors but from Dante, whom he follows

¹ See Crescini, *Contributo agli studi sul Boccaccio*, Turin, 1887, p. 200, n. 3.

² *Filocolo*, Vol. I, pp. 10, 11; 18, 19; Vol. II (= *Opere volgari*, Vol. VIII), pp. 309 ff.

for example in using the word *Dis* to refer to a city instead of to a god.¹ Boccaccio seems to have followed pretty closely the *Merlin* of Robert de Boron, or one of the Italian versions of it, such as the *Vita di Merlino* or the *Storia di Merlino* of Paolino Pieri, the former having a longer account of the conclave in Hell than the latter.² However, if Robert de Boron welds his epic matter fairly well with the story of a marvelous magician, Boccaccio is less successful in thrusting the same story into the history of a simple pilgrimage into Spain.

Boccaccio follows Robert de Boron in putting the infernal council after the descent of Christ into Hell and the liberation of the sinners.³ Both versions are characterized by a recital of grievances against the Almighty, as follows:

- a) The descent of Christ into Hell, and the rescue of the captives.
- b) The safeguarding of the captives against further deceits and assaults of the enemy. Robert de Boron, following the *Évangile de Nicodème*, represents the captives as protected through baptism. Boccaccio, on the other hand, is anxious to give a more warlike tone to his romance. He therefore represents St. James as a knight battling for Christianity; speaks of the converts to Christianity as knights, and consistently calls their religious doctrines "armi." Of course, there was plenty of scriptural authority for these figures of speech.
- c) In the *Merlin*, one of the grievances is the sending of ministers to warn men against Satan and his wiles. This feature does not occur in B, but in A Boccaccio speaks of the mission of St. James to convert the Occident.
- d) In the *Merlin*, the enemy decides to work against Christ for revenge, operating through fear. In the *Filocolo*, Pluto decides to wreak his revenge by frightening Lelio and his party.
- e) In the *Merlin*, the devil takes the "samblance d'homme."⁴ In the *Filocolo*, Pluto takes the appearance of the governor of Marmorina. It is thus not necessary to appeal to general mediaeval

¹ Cf. *Inferno*, ed. Grandgent, Boston, 1909, Canto VIII, vs. 68, note.

² *Storia di Merlino*, ed. Sanesi, Bergamo, 1898, p. lxxiii.

³ See Crescini, *Fiorio e Bianciflore*, Vol. I, p. 151.

⁴ *Merlin*, p. 3.

tradition, as Crescini does, for the explanation of Pluto's supposed power to assume the shape of a man.¹

The principal contribution of Robert de Boron to the story of a conclave in Hell was, it will be recalled, to relate events happening later than in the *Évangile de Nicodème*. The principal contribution of Boccaccio, on the other hand, was to go farther back than either the *Merlin* or the *Évangile*. To Robert de Boron's list of grievances he adds, (a) The expulsion of Pluto and his demons from Heaven by Jupiter; (b) The creation of man, to occupy the seats of the fallen angels; and he boasts of, (c) Tempting man to disobey his maker. Now all these items are found—in almost identical language—in A, B, and C—a fact which confirms our observation regarding Boccaccio's predilection for scriptural—or supposedly scriptural—matter.

The following extracts from B are quoted for purposes of reference:

Il miserabile re . . . pensò di volergli ritrarre da sì fatte imprese con paura; e convocati nel suo cospetto gl' infernali ministri, disse: compagni, voi sapete che Giove non dovutamente degli alti regni i quali possiede ci privò, e diecci questa strema parte sopra il centro dell' universo a possedere; e in dispetto di noi creò nuova progenia, la quale i nostri luoghi riempiesse: noi ingegnosaute gli sottraemmo, sicchè noi volgemma i loro passi alle nostre case: e egli ancora, non parendogli averci tanto oltraggiato, mandò il suo figliuolo a spogliarcene, al quale non possendo noi resistere ci spogliò; e dopo tutto questo fece avveduti gli abitanti della terra de' nostri lacciuoli, e donò loro armi colle quali essi leggiermente le nostre spezzano; e che noi di questi oltraggi ci abbiamo a vendicare sopra di lui. Il salire in su c'è vietato, ed egli è più possente di noi, però ci conviene, pure con ingegno, il nostro regno aumentare, e fare di riavere ciò che peraddietro abbiamo perduto.²

Ond' io ho proposto di volergli almeno ritrargli dell' andare gli strani templi visitando con paura.³

. . . e provvide di nuova generazione volere riempire l'abbandonate sedie. . . .⁴

V

Sannazaro's *De Partu Virginis* (1526) is connected with the subject of the infernal council because of two passages, (a) David's long prophecy concerning the life of the Messiah, including his descent

¹ Crescini, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 152 ff.

² *Filocolo*, Vol. I, pp. 18, 19.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

into Hell and his liberation of the captives; (b) the address of God to the blessed in Heaven, at the beginning of Book III. The prophecy of David comes after the angel Gabriel has returned to Heaven after the Annunciation. The speech of the Father follows the account of the joyful behavior of Joseph and Mary at the birth of Jesus, and is followed by a scene in which the shepherds hear the angel chorus proclaiming that a son is given. In his speech, God recounts the triumphs of the divine will over Satan, who has attempted to usurp the throne of Heaven, and exhorts his angels to rejoice over the birth of Christ.

In the first two books of the *De Partu Virginis* Sannazaro was indebted to classical sources for little more than a few passages such as the description of the monsters in Hell, found at the close of Book I.¹ On the other hand, he was inspired to a great extent by the Scriptures, and somewhat by the *Filocolo*, which he had already imitated in his *Arcadia*.² The long prophecy of David regarding the life of the Messiah is no doubt modeled on the similar long medley of Biblical history recited by Ilario to Florio. The address of the Father in Book III is an imitation of the address of Pluto to his minions in the *Filocolo*, the rôles of the speakers being inverted, the Father reciting as triumphs what Pluto had rehearsed as grievances:

Aetherei Proceres (neque enim ignoratis et ausus
Infandos, dirumque acies super astra frementes)
Si mecum iuvat antiquos ab origine motus
Inspicere, et veterum pariter meminisse laborum:
Quandoquidem haec vobis peperit victoriae laudem:
Huc animos, huc pacatas advertite mentes.
Vos, quum omne arderet caelum servilibus armis,
Arctorumque furor pertenderet impius axem
Scandere, et in gelidos regnum transferre Triones:
Fida manus mecum mansistis: et ultima tandem
Experti, caelo victricia signa tulistis.³

The following passage from the prophecy of David is based on a collection of scriptural passages, on the plan of the long speech of Ilario in the *Filocolo*:

Ipse catenato fessus per tartara collo
Ducetur Pluton: tristi quem murmure circum

¹ See F. Flamini, *Il Cinquecento*, Milan, p. 106.

² See *Arcadia*, ed. Scherillo, Turin, 1888, pp. II-lvii.

³ Book III, p. 76. I quote from the edition of Rome, 1877.

Inferni fractis moerebunt cornibus amnes.
 At nos virgines praecincti tempora lauru,
 Signa per extentos caeli victricia campos
 Tollemus, laetoeque Ducem clamore sequemur.
 Victor io, bellator io, tu regna profunda,
 Tu Manes, Erebumque, Potestatesque coërces
 Aërias, Letumque tu sub Numine torques.
 Ille alto temone sedens, levibusque quadrigis
 Lora dabit, volucresque reget placido ore iugales,
 Non iam cornipedum ductos de semine equorum.¹

For his descriptions of scenes in Hell in Book I, however, Sannazaro imitated Claudian and Virgil.

The following description of the commotion produced among the powers of the deep by the triumphant approach of Christ is imitated freely from the *De Raptu Proserpinae*:

Intremuere Erebi sedes, obscuraque Ditis
 Limina: suspirans imo de corde Megaera
 Dat geminum, et torvas spectat sine mente Sorores.
 Tum caudam exululans sub ventre recondidit atram
 Cerberus, et soutes latratu terruit umbras:
 Commotis niger Cocytus inhorruit antris:
 Et vagas Sisyphiis haeserunt saxa lacertis.²

The description of the monsters of the deep, which slink into their holes at the approach of Christ, is imitated closely from Virgil's account of the monsters seen by Aeneas in Hades:

. . . . diffungiant immisso lumine dirae
 Eumenidum facies iactis in terga colubris.
 Quas atro vix in limo Phlegethontis adustum
 Accipiat nemus, et fremanti condant in ulva.
 Tum variae pestes, et monstra horrentia Ditis
 Ima petant: Trepident Briareia turba,³ Cerastae,
 Semiferumque genus Centauri, et Gorgones atrae,
 Scyllaeque, Sphingesque, ardentisque ore Chimaerae,
 Atque Hydrae, atque Canes et terribiles Harpyiae.⁴

¹ Book I, p. 34. Cf. Psalms, 68:18; II Colossians, 5:15; I Colossians, 15:26; Revelation, 20:2 and 14.

² *De Partu Virginis*, I, 30. Cf. *De Raptu Proserpinae*, I, vss. 83-88, cited above, p. 171.

³ *Briareia turba*, from *De Raptu Proserpinae*, III, vs. 188. *Cerastae*, from *De Raptu Proserpinae*, II, vs. 346. See Lewis and Short's *Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1896.

⁴ *De Partu Virginis*, I, 33. Cf. *Aeneid* vi. 275 ff.

The description of the monsters in the *De Partu Virginis*, as we shall see, influenced Vida, Tasso, and Milton. The following line probably also was imitated by Tasso:

. . . . liceat rumpentem cernere portas
Aëratas. . . .¹

VI

The action of the *Christiad* (1535) of Vida begins with the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, in the last year of his ministry. Stopping at the house of Zaccheus, the Savior is informed by a messenger of the death of Lazarus. He departs to restore Lazarus to life, and Satan calls a council of his demons, who, alarmed by the success of Christ's mission on earth, determine to combat God by persuading the Rabbis to persecute his son. In his impassioned harangue, Satan recounts the past victories of God, who, not content with driving the rebellious angels out of Heaven, is preparing to send his son into Hell itself, to rescue the captives.

For his description of the conclave in Hell, Vida borrowed from the *Filocolo* and the *De Partu Virginis*. Vida and Boccaccio represent the chief demon's harangue as beginning with a stirring appeal to the memory of an unjust expulsion from Heaven, and of a valorous struggle against the Almighty. The following statements of grievances may be compared with the passages from the *Filocolo* quoted above.

In partemque homini nostri data regia caeli est
Nec satis: arma iterum molitur²
Id propter juvenem aetherea demisit ab arce
Iamque aderit, fretusque armis caelestibus ille
Sedibus exitium vehit his, et regna recludet
Infera, concessasque animas nostra eximet orbe
Irrita tentamenta, dolos et vim exiit omnem.³

It will be noted that Vida follows Boccaccio even in the use of the rather characteristic word "arms," which Boccaccio had substituted for the "baptism" which he had found in the *Merlin*.

¹ *De Partu Virginis*, I, 31.

² Here, as elsewhere, Vida seems to have been influenced by the style of Claudian. Cf. the lines *Nonne satis visum*, etc., quoted above, p. 171.

³ *Christiad*, I, 182-202. I quote from the edition of London, 1732.

The opening lines of the speech of Satan to his followers in the *Christiad*, on the other hand, were imitated directly from a passage in the *De Partu Virginis*,¹ which was itself modeled, as we have observed, on a speech of Pluto in the *Filocolo*. The things which God, in addressing the blessed in Heaven, recounts approvingly as triumphs in the poem of Sannazaro, are included in the list of grievances found in Satan's harangue in Vida's poem. Thus Vida remodeled the verses of his predecessor, just as Claudian had transformed the divine council of Zeus to a conclave of demons in Hades.

A comparison will readily show to what an extent the speech in the *Christiad* is a counterpart of that in the *De Partu Virginis*. The Father begins with the words "Aetherei proceres"; Satan says "Tartarei proceres." Then follow parentheses, in which Vida paraphrases Sannazaro:

Tartarei proceres, caelo gens orta sereno,
(Quos olim huc superi mecum inclementia regis
Aethere dejectos flagranti fulmine adegit,
Dum regno cavet, ac sceptris multa invidus ille
Permetuit, refugitque parem), quae praelia toto
Egerimus caelo, quibus olim denique utrimque
Sit certatum odiis, notum et meminisse necesse est.
Ille astris potitur, parte et plus occupat aequa
Aetheris, ac poenas inimica e gente recepit
Crudeles: pro sideribus, pro luce serena
Nobis senta situ loca, sole carentia tecta
Reddidit.²

¹ The influence of Sannazaro upon Vida has been a matter of controversy. G. Moroncini (*Sulla "Cristiade" di M. G. Vida*, Trani, 1896, p. 45) is inclined to deny such an influence. Cotronei, in the *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, XXI, 364, reviewing Moroncini's book, emphasizes three resemblances between the *Christiad* and the *De Partu Virginis*: (1) The scene of the Virgin weeping at the cross; (2) The description of the Limbus; (3) The enumeration of the people who came to be recorded in the census taken under Augustus. G. Morpurgo, in a volume inaccessible to me entitled *La poesia religiosa di Jacopo Sannazaro*, Ancona, 1909, maintains that there is indisputable evidence of the imitation of Sannazaro in the *Christiad*. (See *Romanic Review*, I [1910], 450.)

E. Yardley (*Notes and Queries*, 10th series, I [1914], 249) observes that in the *Christiad*, V, there is the episode of "Fear" called forth by Satan to frighten Pilate. Have we not here the "paura" on which Pluto laid so much stress in his speech in the *Filocolo*?

² *Christiad*, I, 167 ff.

The following lines in the *Christiad* are imitated from the prophecy of David in the *De Partu Virginis*:

Fors quoque nos, nisi non segnes occurrimus ipsos
Areta in vincla dabit, vinctosque inducet Olympo
Victor, ovans; superi illudent toto aethere captis.¹

For his description of the monsters of the deep, Vida has imitated Claudian, Sannazaro, and especially Virgil:

Continuo ruit ad portas gens omnis, et adsunt
Lucifugi coetus varia atque bicorpora monstra,
Pube tenus hominum facies, verum hispida in anguem
Desinit ingenti sinuata volumine cauda.
Gorgonas hi, Sphyngasque obscoeno corpore reddunt;
Centaurusque, Hydrasque illi, ignivomasque Chimaeras;
Centum alii Scyllas, ac foedificas Harpyias,
Et quae multa homines simulacra horrentia fingunt.
At centum-geminus flammanti vertice supra est
Arbiter ipse Erebi, centenaque brachia jactat
Centimanus, totidemque eructat faucibus aestus
Omnes luctificum fumumque, atrosque procaci
Ore, oculisque ignes, et vastis naribus efflant.²

The first lines in this passage are imitated from the *De Raptu Proserpinae*,³ and the names of the monsters are nearly all taken from Virgil; but the passage was probably inspired in the first place by Sannazaro, who adds "Sphinges" to the list found in the *Aeneid*, a change which Vida adopts.

VII

The infernal council in the *Gerusalemme Liberata* is found in the fourth Canto of that epic. The military operations of the Christians have been going well. Pluto, alarmed at their progress, calls a council of war in Hell, at which it is decided to send the fair Armida to work havoc among the Christians. In his harangue, Pluto relates how he and his followers have been expelled from Heaven, and how man—made of vile clay—has been put in their places. Nor was this sufficient: God sent his son, who broke the gates of Hell, and took back with him many souls.

¹ *Ibid.*, I, 190 ff. Cf. the fifth and following lines in the second passage from the *De Partu Virginis* quoted above on pp. 177 f. and the last line of the first passage.

² *Christiad*, I, 139 ff.

³ See the third passage quoted above, p. 171.

For his description of the infernal council, Tasso drew upon Virgil, Claudian, Boccaccio, Sannazaro, and Vida.¹

In the following passage, Tasso seems to be indebted not only to Vida, but also to Boccaccio:

x

E in vece del dì sereno e puro,
De l' aureo sol, de gli stellati giri,
N'ha qui rinchiusi in questo abisso oscuro;
Né vuol ch'al primo onor per noi s'aspiri:
E poscia (ah! quanto a ricordarlo è duro!
Quest' è quel, che più inaspra i miei martiri)
Ne' bei seggi celesti ha l'uomo chiamato,
L'uom vile e di vil fango in terra nato.

xi

Né ciò gli parve assai; ma in preda a morte,
Sol per farne più danno, il figlio diede.
Ei venne, e ruppe le tartaree porte,
E porre osò ne' regni nostri il piede,
E trarne l'alme a noi dovute in sorte.²

Ne' bei seggi is here very much like Boccaccio's *abbandonate sedie*,³ and

Né ciò gli parve assai; ma in preda a morte,
Sol per farne più danno, il figlio diede

¹ The influence of Vida upon Tasso has been a subject of remark for the last three centuries (see Solerti, in a review of V. Vivaldi's *Sulle fonti della Gerusalemme Liberata*, *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, XXIV [1894], 257). Solerti quotes here from MS Magliabechiano II. IV. 192, cc. 305-306, where the note is made: "Nel IV, conciglio (sic) del diavolo, dal Vida, *Cristiade*, I, donde è tratta gran parte dell' orazione." Solerti observes that G. B. Olivi, in his *Concilium Inferorum*, is indebted to Vida and to Tasso. Rosini, in his edition of the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, has worked out in great detail the indebtedness of Tasso to Vida and to Claudian in stanzas iv-xi. Vivaldi, in *La Gerusalemme Liberata studiata nelle sue fonti*, Trani, 1907, p. 25, gives some additional resemblances between Tasso and Vida.

² I quote from the edition by Ferrari, Florence, 1907. Rosini hints at the indebtedness of Tasso to Boccaccio: "Questa orazione di Pluto è da conferirsi con quella del medesimo attribuitogli dal Boccaccio nel primo libro del *Filocolo*, lvi: 'Compagni, voi sapete ec . . .'" (Canto IV, ix, note). A similar assertion is made by F. de Sanctis, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, Bari, 1912, Vol. I, p. 285. S. Multineddu, in his *Fonti della Gerusalemme Liberata*, Turin, 1895, pp. 52 ff., denies this connection between the *Gerusalemme* and the *Filocolo*, and associates Tasso's infernal council with that in Robert de Boron's *Merlin*. Flamini, in his *Cinquecento*, p. 516, apparently accepts Multineddu's conclusions. On the other hand, Multineddu (p. 22) agrees with Guastavini, D'Ancona, and others in associating the episode of Olindo and Sofronia with the burning at the stake of Florio and Biancofiore related in Book VI of the *Filocolo*. Cf. Solerti, *op. cit.*, p. 264. Vivaldi (*op. cit.*, pp. 32, 33) denies the connection between the *Gerusalemme* and the *Merlin* on the one hand and the *Filocolo* on the other. Cf. review by Proto in *Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana*, I, 67.

³ *Filocolo*, Vol. I, p. 10.

certainly recalls

. . . . e egli ancora, non parendogli averci tanto oltraggiato, mandò il suo figliuolo.

Furthermore, the enumeration of grievances is made more formally by Tasso than by Vida, after the style of the *Filocolo*, thus: (1) *N'ha qui rinchiusi*; (2) *E poscia*; (3) *Né ciò gli parve assai*. Both Tasso and Boccaccio have little parentheses denoting exasperation: "Quest' è quel che più inaspra" and "non parendogli averci tanto oltraggiato."

For the opening lines of Pluto's speech, Tasso follows Vida very closely, as will appear on comparison of the following lines with those in Vida beginning "Tartarei proceres":

ix

Tartarei numi, di seder più degni
Là sovra il sole, ond' è l'origin vostra,
Che meco già da i più felici regni
Spinse il gran caso in questa orribil chiostra;
Gli antichi altrui sospetti e i fieri sdegni
Noti son troppo, e l'alta impresa nostra.
Or Colui regge a suo voler le stelle,
E noi siam giudicati alme rubelle.

x

Ed in vece del dì sereno e puro,
De l' aureo sol, de gli stellati giri,
N'ha qui rinchiusi in questo abisso oscuro.¹

The imitation of Vida by Tasso amounts in some places almost to a translation. At the end of stanza xi, however, Tasso appears to have gone directly to Sannazaro for his inspiration:

Vincitor trionfando, e in nostro scherno
L'insegne ivi spiegar del vinto Inferno.

For this Sannazaro has:

. . . . et ultima tandem

Experti, caelo victricia signa tulistis

and

Signa per extentos caeli victricia campos
Tollemus, laetorque Ducem clamore sequemur.
Victor io, bellator io.²

¹ The passage from Vida is quoted above, p. 180.

² See above, pp. 177 f.

Vida has

Areta in vincla dabit, vinctosque Olympo
Victor, ovans.¹

Only Vida and Sannazaro here refer to the captivity of Satan and his demons. The display of the captured trophies of Hell, however, is mentioned solely by Sannazaro and Tasso.

For his description of the monsters of the deep, Tasso imitated Virgil, Sannazaro, and Claudian:

iv

Tosto gli dèi d'Abisso in varie torme
Concorron d'ogn' intorno a l' alte porte.
Oh come strane, oh come orribil forme!
Quant' è ne gli occhi lor terrore e morte!
Stampano alcuni il suol di ferine orme,
E 'n fronte umana han chiome d'angui attorte;
E lor s'aggira dietro immensa coda,
Che, quasi sferza, si ripiega e snoda.

v

Qui mille immonde Arpie vedresti e mille
Centauri e Sfingi e pallide Gorgoni;
Molte e molte latrar voraci Scille,
E fischiar Idre, e sibilare Pitoni,
E vomitar Chimere atre faville,
E Polifemi orrendi e Gerioni;
E in nuovi mostri, e non più intesi o visti,
Diversi aspetti in un confusi e misti.

The first line of stanza iv is apparently imitated from the *De Raptu Proserpinae*:

Iam quaecumque latent ferali monstra barathro
In turmas aciemque ruunt.²

Sannazaro's addition of "Sphinges" to the list found in the *Aeneid* is adopted by both Vida and Tasso. Sannazaro also has "Canes," in addition to "Scyllae." Tasso mentions "Cerberus" farther on, but there he is probably imitating another passage from Claudian. On the other hand, in the *Gerusalemme Conquistata*, Tasso copies

¹ See above, p. 181.

² See above, p. 171.

even this detail from Sannazaro: "E latrar cani mostruosi."¹ *Gerioni*, in Tasso, indicates clearly that the author was directly imitating Virgil's "forma tricorporis umbrae."

In the *Christiad*, Briareus is depicted as the master of the deep. Tasso follows Sannazaro and Virgil, putting Polifemi (for Briareus?) on a plane with the other monsters, but in his description of Pluto is influenced by the picture of Briareus in the *Christiad*.

The description of the council of the Furies in the *In Rufinum* may have had some influence on Vida and Tasso.

Tasso probably went directly to Claudian for the following lines, although there are also close verbal resemblances with Sannazaro:

iii

Treman le spaziose atre caverne,
E l'aer cieco a quel romor rimbomba.

viii

Mentre ei parlava, Cerbero i latrati
Ripresse, e l'Idra si fe' muta al suono;
Restò Cocito, e ne tremâr gli abissi;
E in questi detti il gran rimbombo udissi.²

In the following lines, Tasso was doubtless imitating the *De Raptu Proserpinae* and the *In Rufinum*:

xiii

Noi trarrem neghittosi i giorni e l'ore,
Né degna cura fia che 'l cor n'accenda?

¹ V. 3. For the influence of Sannazaro upon Tasso, see Scherillo, *Arcadia*, ed. cit., p. ccxxxvi, where the author states his belief in the connection between the *De Partu Virginis* and the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, and promises to study the matter in detail elsewhere. Vivaldi (op. cit., p. 26), attempts to disprove all connection between the *Gerusalemme* and the *De Partu Virginis*, at least so far as the descriptions of the monsters of the deep is concerned. He even denies that Tasso borrowed directly from Virgil, though the contrary is shown by *Gerioni* in Tasso. He says Virgil has 'angue di Lerna' while Tasso has 'Idre,' a distinction which I fail to grasp. Also, he calls attention to the fact that Tasso and Vida have 'Sfingi,' not found in Virgil. However, it is Sannazaro who introduces "Sphinges," a proof that Vida and Tasso imitated him as well as Virgil. If 'Idre' be really different from 'angue di Lerna,' there is one more proof of the influence of Sannazaro, who also has *Hydrae*. Furthermore, while it is true that Tasso does not, like Virgil, have 'Briareo,' that monster figures not only in Sannazaro's list, but is the most important of all the monsters in the *Christiad*, which, according to Vivaldi, Tasso imitated, to the exclusion of Virgil. Vivaldi himself confesses that "cani," which is suspiciously like Sannazaro's "Canes," is found in the *Gerusalemme Conquistata*. Morpurgo, who lays great emphasis upon the influence of Sannazaro on Tasso, says that Tasso owed to him 'tutta la mossa iniziale della Gerusalemme' (*Romanic Review*, I, 450). For the tremendous influence of Sannazaro upon his epoch, see Torraca, *Scritti critici*, 1907, pp. 65-69. Cf. also A. Sainati, *Iacopo Sannazaro e Joachim du Bellay*, Pisa, 1915.

² See *De Raptu Proserpinae*, I, 83-88, quoted above on p. 171, and the passage from the *De Partu Virginis*, I, 30, quoted above on p. 178. *Rimbomba* (iii) and *rimbombo* (viii) are doubtless imitated from Vida's "antra intonare profunda" (op. cit., I, vs. 137).

The *De Raptu Proserpinae* has:

. . . . An forte iacentes
Ignavosque putas, quod non. . . . ¹

The *In Rufinum* has:

At nos indecores longo torpebimus aevo
Omnibus eiectar regnis?²

For purposes of reference, stanzas xi and xv of Canto IV are quoted here:

xi

Né ciò glu parve assai; ma in preda a morte,
Sol per farne piú danno, il figlio diede.
Ei venne, e ruppe le tartaree porte,
E porre osò ne' regni nostri il piede,
E trarne l'alme a noi dovute in sorte,
E riportarne al ciel sì ricche prede,
Vincitor trionfando, e in nostro scherno
L'insegne ivi spiegar del vinto Inferno.

xv

Ah! non fia ver; ché non sono anco estinti
Gli spirti in voi di quel valor primiero,
Quando di ferro e d'alte fiamme cinti
Pugnammo già contra il celeste impero.
Fummo, io no 'l niego, in quel conflitto vinti:
Pur non mancò virtute al gran pensiero.
Diede, che che si fosse, allor vittoria:
Rimase a noi d'invitto ardir la gloria.

VIII

Milton seems to have relished the idea of an infernal council. In *Paradise Lost*, we have the harangue of Satan to his followers in Book I; the great debate in Pandemonium, in Book II; the chorus of hisses which greeted Satan on his return to Pandemonium, in Book X. In the first book of *Paradise Regained*³ there is also an infernal council, on much the same model as the others. Furthermore, at the age of seventeen, Milton had already described an assembling of the wicked angels by Satan, preparatory to an attack upon Britain, which alone resisted successfully the plots of the Pope.⁴

¹ See above, p. 171.

² See above, p. 171.

³ Vs. 40 ff.

⁴ In *Quintum Novembria*.

The opening scene of *Paradise Lost* is in Hell, where Satan attempts to rouse his comrades with the hope of regaining Heaven. In order to discuss ways and means of waging war against the Almighty, a council is held in the palace of Pandemonium. The debate which ensues occupies most of Book II. After the opening address by Satan, Moloch, Belial, and Mammon offer their opinions. Satan, in his harangue in Book I, had suggested an attack on the new world, with its newly-created inhabitants. Beelzebub, now supporting Satan, also advises an attack. Apparently no one of the angels is hardy enough to venture upon the difficult quest of the new world. Satan finally volunteers to go himself. In Book X Satan, after finding the new world, and tempting man from Eden, returns to relate his triumph. He finds that he is greeted not with applause, as before, but with hisses, because he and his followers are changed to serpents.

As a counterpart to the councils in Hell, there is a council in Heaven, in Book III. The Almighty, aware of the mission of Satan, determines to frustrate him, and tells his son of the manner in which the world is to be redeemed, through the atonement. The son of God voluntarily accepts the great destiny which is laid upon him.

For his infernal councils, as well as for the council in Heaven, Milton imitated Tasso, Vida, Sannazaro, Boccaccio, and Claudian, in addition to Aeschylus, Dante, and Marino, the author of the *Strage degli innocenti*. His indebtedness to Tasso was so striking that it claimed attention at an early date, Addison in England and Voltaire in France being among those to remark upon it. The influence of Vida upon Milton was largely exerted indirectly, through Tasso, and has usually been studied in this manner.¹ Little has been said, however, about a direct influence of Sannazaro upon Milton,² and, so far as I am aware, nothing at all about a direct influence of Boccaccio on the great Puritan poet. Furthermore, there are one

¹ Cf. Flamini, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

² Marianna Woodhull, in *The Epic of Paradise Lost*, London, 1907, p. 142, declares: "The influence of the *De Partu Virginis* can be traced also only in such minor details as the descriptive passage of the flowers that lift their heads to greet the Virgin, as they also in *Paradise Lost* welcome the coming of Eve; the larger problem of the two works is not only different, but the method is in strong contrast." Morpurgo (*op. cit.*) associates the speech of God to the blessed in Heaven, which has been quoted in part from the *De Partu Virginis*, with the harangue delivered by Satan to his demons in *Paradise Lost*, I. Also, the long prophecy of David concerning Christ, he thinks, influenced Milton's

or two little gaps in the published material on Tasso's influence on Milton,¹ long though this question has been debated.

For example, Pommrich, following the commentators, rightly associates the description of the opening of Satan's address,

He called so loud that all the hollow deep
Of Hell resounded!²

with the passages in the *Gerusalemme* which we have already noted, passages which are themselves imitated from Vida, and Claudian, very likely with Sannazaro as a first inspiration. However, he might have said something about the remainder of his speech.

. . . Princes, Potentates,

Warriors, the flower of Heaven, once yours, now lost,

is doubtless a direct imitation of Vida's

Tartarei proceres, caelo gens orta sereno.³

The next lines are:

If such astonishment as this can seize
Eternal spirits: or have ye chosen this place
After the toil of battle to repose
Your wearied virtue, for the ease you find
To slumber here, or in the vales of Heaven?

For these, Tasso has:

Noi trarrem neghittosi i giorni e l'ore,
Né degna cura fia che'l cor n'accenda?

At the same time, Milton may have consulted the original passages in Claudian, also:

. . . An forte iacentes,

Ignavosque putas, quod non. . . .

and

At nos indecores longo torpebimus aevo
Omnibus eiectae regnis?⁴

"demon chorus." With the first statement I am disposed to agree. The second is acceptable also, provided "demon chorus" means the hissing of the serpents in Book X. Unfortunately, I am compelled to rely upon the summary of Morpurgo's book which appeared in the *Romanic Review*, I, but so far as I am able to judge, the only trouble with Morpurgo's argument is that it does not go quite far enough.

¹ For Tasso's influence upon Milton, the reader is referred to the standard commentators, especially some of the older ones, such as Todd. Cf. E. Pommrich, *Miltons Verhältnis zu Torquato Tasso*, Leipzig dissertation, 1902.

² Pommrich, p. 34. *Gerusalemme Liberata*, IV, stanzas iii and viii. Cf. *Paradise Lost*, I, 314 ff.

³ See above, p. 180.

⁴ See above, p. 171.

Milton continues:

Or in this abject posture have ye sworn
To adore the conqueror, who now beholds
Cherub and Seraph rolling in the flood
With scattered arms and ensigns; till anon
His swift pursuers from Heaven-gates discern
The advantage, and descending, tread us down
Thus drooping, or with linked thunderbolts
Transfix us to this gulf?

Here there is no exact parallel in any of the poems which we have been studying. Nevertheless the *De Partu Virginis*, the *Christiad*, and the *Gerusalemme Liberata* all refer to Christ's carrying the war into Hell, and (with the exception of the last-named work) to his driving the demons from Hell.

The last words of the speech in *Paradise Lost*

Arise, Arise, or be forever fallen!

may well have been suggested by Milton's own

Surge, age! surge, piger . . .

in the *In Quintum Novembris*.

Pommrich also associates the descriptions of the hissing of the serpents on the return of Satan to Pandemonium with the picture of the monsters in Hell as described by Tasso:¹

. . . Dreadful was the din
Of hissing through the hall, thick-swarming now
With complicated monsters, head and tail,
Scorpion, and asp, and amphisbaena dire,
Cerastes horned, hydrus, and ellops drear,
And dipsas (not so thick swarmed once the soil
Bedropt with blood of Gorgon, or the isle
Ophiusa); but still greatest he the midst,
Now dragon grown, larger than whom the sun
Engendered in the Pythian vale on slime,
Huge Python.

However, "complicated monsters" seems an imitation of Vida's "bi-corpora monstra"² rather than of anything in Tasso. Furthermore,

¹ Pommrich, p. 36. See *Paradise Lost*, X, 521 ff.

² See also, p. 181. Another imitation of Vida by Milton is noted by Yardley in the third fragment of the Armada epic, where Milton's "Terror" is patterned on the familiar "Fear" of Vida and Boccaccio.

"Cerastes," mentioned neither by Tasso nor by Vida, is found in the *De Partu Virginis*.

The passage quoted from *Paradise Lost* is usually explained as an imitation of Pliny, who gives the names of most of the serpents here mentioned. In view of his other imitations, direct or indirect, of Sannazaro, it seems likely that Milton here, as frequently happened, first got his general idea from Italian authors, then filled in the details from his wonderful knowledge of classical literature.

The fact should especially be borne in mind that Satan's address to the demons in Book X, which immediately precedes the description of the serpents, is in a sense a replica, after achievement of his harangues of complaint in Books I and II. Naturally there is some repetition of the old phraseology, and it is therefore the more likely that Milton consulted here the same Italian authors as at the beginning of the epic. This conclusion is confirmed by the observation of Ingleby that in the preceding book of *Paradise Lost* there is a soliloquy of Satan which is also patterned on the infernal council described in the *Gerusalemme Liberata*.¹

. . . . or to spite us more—
Determined to advance into our room
A creature formed of earth, and him endow
Exalted from so base original,
With Heavenly spoils, our spoils.

This is clearly related to stanzas x and xi in Tasso's account of the council:

x

Ne' bei seggi ha l'uom chiamato,
L'uom vile, e di vil fango in terra nato,

xi

E riportarne al ciel sì ricche prede,
Vincitor trionfando, e in nostro scherno
L'insengne ivi spiegar del vinto Inferno.

In a speech of Christ in Book III of *Paradise Lost* the imitation of the second passage quoted from the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, and more especially of a passage in the *De Partu Virginis*, is very marked.

¹ *Paradise Lost*, IX, 147 ff. Cf. *Gerusalemme Liberata*, IV, stanzas x, xi. See H. Ingleby, in *Notes and Queries*, 10th series, I, 203.

The Milton commentators have here generally been satisfied to refer to the scriptural verses from which Milton's lines are ultimately drawn, without regard to the language of the Italian poets which undoubtedly was Milton's first inspiration:

But I shall rise victorious, and subdue
My vanquisher, spoiled of his vaunted spoil.
Death his death's wound shall then receive, and stoop
Inglorious, of his mortal sting disarmed;
I through the ample air in triumph high
Shall lead Hell captive maugre Hell, and show
The powers of Darkness bound. Thou, at the sight
Pleased, out of Heaven shalt look down and smile,
While, by thee raised, I ruin all my foes,
Death last, and with his carcase glut my grave;
Then, with the multitude of my redeemed,
Shall enter Heaven, long absent, and return.¹

If we compare this passage with one quoted from the prophecy of David in the *De Partu Virginis*,² we shall find the following resemblances:

Ipsè catenato fessus per tartara collo
Ducetur Pluton.

Shall lead Hell captive maugre Hell, and show
The powers of Darkness bound.

. . . . laetoeque Ducem clamore sequemur³

. . . . Thou, at the sight

Pleased

Victor io, bellator io

But I shall rise victorious

. . . . tu regna profunda,
Tu Manes, Erebumque, Potestatesque coërces
Aërias, Letumque tu sub Numine torques.

. . . . I ruin all my foes,
Death last, and with his carcase glut the grave.

¹ *Paradise Lost*, III, 250 ff.

² See above, p. 177.

³ Cf. *Christiad*, I, vs. 192: Superi illudent toto aethere captis, etc.

Ille alto temone sedens, levibusque quadrigis
Lora dabit, volucresque reget placido ore iugales,

Non iam cornipedum ductos de semine equorum.

I through the ample air in triumph high
Shall lead

Though both Vida and Tasso here imitated Sannazaro, two features, the conquest of Death, and the triumphant ride of the Savior through the air, are common to Sannazaro and Milton alone. For the last two lines quoted from Milton,

Then with the multitude of my redeemed
Shall enter Heaven. . . .

parallels in Sannazaro, Vida, and Tasso are numerous, and need not be cited now. What is probable is that Milton got his first pattern from Sannazaro and others, then remodeled their language to make it conform still more closely to that of the Scriptures. In fact, the whole idea of representing the Father and the Son as speaking virtually the exact language of the Scriptures throughout the *Paradise Lost*, while obvious enough, may possibly have been first suggested to Milton by his reading of Italian authors.

It is also more than likely that Milton was influenced by Sannazaro in the long prophecy of future events, down to the second coming of Christ, which the angel Gabriel delivers to Adam in Books XI and XII of *Paradise Lost*, in view of the fact that the prophecy of David concerning the life of Christ, in the *De Partu Virginis*, is of somewhat similar style and of about the same length. It is likely, too, Milton had in mind the summary of the Old and New Testaments which Ilario delivered to Florio in Book V of the *Filocolo*. Florio listens to Ilario with much the same rapt attention that Adam shows to Michael.

Milton also imitated Boccaccio, consciously or unconsciously, in another respect. When he resumed work on his masterpiece, eighteen years after his return from Italy, it was Milton's purpose to begin with what is now Book III, where Satan, already escaped from Hell, finds himself in the Universe, and makes his beautiful apostrophe to the Sun.¹ Later Milton not only introduced an infernal

¹ D. Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, London, 1877, Vol. V, pp. 406, 407.

council into his *Paradise Lost* which was patterned ultimately, if not directly, on the one in the *Filocolo*; but, as in the case of the *Filocolo*, it was by means of this infernal council that the transformation of *Paradise Lost* to the epic form was accomplished.

Of course Milton's familiarity not only with what he calls the "lofty fables" of the Middle Ages, but also with the "romances" of that period, is beyond dispute.¹ That Milton had some of the old "romances" in mind when he penned Book I of *Paradise Lost* is proved by the lines of the poem itself.²

To summarize: the pagan suggestion of the infernal council appears in Claudian; the Christian tradition begins with the Gospel of Nicodemus. From the French version of this Gospel, Robert de Boron drew the condensed account in the *Merlin*. Boccaccio was undoubtedly influenced by the *Merlin*, which he probably knew in one of the extant Italian versions. The infernal council in the *Filocolo* directly influenced those in Vida's *Christiad* and Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*, as well as the address of the Father in Heaven in Sannazaro's *De Partu Virginis*. Vida and Tasso also borrowed from Claudian's *De Raptu Proserpinae* and from Sannazaro's *De Partu Virginis*. Milton's *Paradise Lost* harks back to Tasso and to Vida, especially in Books I and II. Indirectly Milton was frequently influenced by Sannazaro, and directly in several places. In Books XI and XII Milton may also have been influenced by the long prophecy of David in the *De Partu Virginis*, probably also by the long discourse of Ilario in the *Filocolo*.

OLIN H. MOORE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

¹ See *Prose Works*, London, 1901, Vol. III, p. 118 (*An Apology for Smectymnus*).

² See *Paradise Lost*, I, 580 ff.



POE'S EXTENSION OF HIS THEORY OF THE TALE

The discussion of narrative technique contained in Poe's review of Hawthorne (1842) has been correctly signalized as establishing in America—with a solidarity for which there seems to be no counterpart in European literatures—a doctrine of the short story. The constant implication, however, that the 1842 statement stands by itself, complete and without antecedent, should not pass unchallenged. There occur in Poe's works various foreshadowings of the theory, and certain ramifications, which are worthy of mention. I do not refer to the parallel theory of the brief poem, already clearly presented in 1836, for the relationship in this case has been repeatedly indicated; I have in mind certain remarks which directly concern prose fiction. In part these demonstrate merely that the principles of the Hawthorne review had been formulated a number of years previously; in part—and this weighs more heavily in the scale—they have some interpretative value.

The idea of unity of effect, the heart of the 1842 statement, already finds expression, and is already applied to fiction, as early as 1835, when Poe writes of Lady Dacre's *Winifred, Countess of Nithsdale*:

The absolute conclusion of this tale speaks volumes for the artist-like skill of the fair authoress. An every day writer would have ended a story of continued sorrow and suffering, with a bright gleam of unalloyed happiness, and sunshine—thus destroying at a single blow that indispensable unity which has been rightly called the unity of effect, and throwing down, as it were, in a paragraph what, perhaps, an entire volume has been laboring to establish.¹

Comparison proves the identity of this principle with that described the following year in the brief-poem criticism mentioned above, in which the author speaks of "what is rightly termed by Schlegel, 'the unity or totality of interest.'"² It is evident in this second case that Poe had been reading Black's translation of August William Schlegel's

¹ *Works* (New York, Crowell, 1902), VIII, 74-75. Here and elsewhere the somewhat unusual punctuation of the original text is reproduced.

² VIII, 126.

Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature, published in Philadelphia in 1833,¹ and that the reference is to certain remarks in the chapter on the French classical drama.² Presumably this is also the source of the 1835 comment; if so, Poe's theory of fiction is related to Schlegel directly, and does not depend, as has been supposed,³ upon an intermediate brief-poem doctrine.

Schlegel in turn, we may note in passing, relates his idea to "*De la Motte*, a French author, who wrote against the whole of the unities."⁴ The reference is evidently to the *Premier Discours sur la Tragédie* by Houdar de la Motte.⁵ Certain sentences in this *Discours* offer a parallel to the most frequently quoted paragraph of Poe's 1842 declaration. La Motte discusses the application of his theory of unity as follows:

Mais en quoi consiste l'art de cette unité dont je parle? c'est, si je ne me trompe, à savoir dès le commencement d'une Pièce, indiquer à l'esprit et au cœur, l'objet principal dont on veut occuper l'un et émouvoir l'autre. . . . Ensuite à n'employer de personnages que ceux qui augmentent ce danger ou qui le partagent avec le Héros; à occuper toujours le Spectateur de ce seul intérêt, de manière qu'il soit présent dans chaque Scène, et qu'on ne s'y permette aucun discours, qui sous prétexte d'ornement, puisse distraire l'esprit de cet objet; et enfin à marcher ainsi jusqu'au dénouement.⁶

And Poe writes:

A skilful literary artist has constructed a tale. If wise, he has not fashioned his thoughts to accommodate his incidents; but having conceived, with deliberate care, a certain unique or single effect to be wrought out, he then invents such incidents—he then combines such events as may best aid him in establishing this preconceived effect. If his very initial sentence tend not to the outbringing of this effect, then he has failed in his first step. In the whole composition there should be no word written, of which the tendency, direct or indirect, is not to the one pre-established design.⁷

But the American nowhere makes any allusion to the French author; and he seems equally unaware of the considerable body of *Novelle* criticism produced by the Schlegel brothers.

¹ As to Poe's familiarity with this translation, cf. Woodberry, *Life of Poe* (Boston, 1909), I, 179-80.

² Pp. 189-90. Schlegel's expression, in the original text, is "Einheit des Interesse."

³ Cf. Baldwin, *American Short Stories* (New York, 1909), Introduction, p. 22.

⁴ *Ed. cit.*, p. 189.

⁵ *Œuvres*, 1754, IV, 37-46.

⁶ P. 45.

⁷ XI, 108.

In 1836, in a review of *Sketches by Boz*, special unity is again discussed, with reference to fiction, together with two other principles—the fallacy of sustained effort, and the desirability of a single, uninterrupted presentation of a story—which with it constitute the three essentials of the ultimate formula:¹

We cannot bring ourselves to believe that less actual ability is required in the composition of a really good “brief article” than in a fashionable novel of the usual dimensions. The novel certainly requires what is denominated a sustained effort—but that is a matter of mere perseverance, and has but a collateral relation to talent. On the other hand—unity of effect, a quality not easily appreciated or indeed comprehended by an ordinary mind, and a *desideratum* difficult of attainment even by those who can conceive it—is indispensable in the “brief article,” and not so in the common novel. The latter, if admired at all, is admired for its detached passages, without reference to the work as a whole—or without reference to any general design—which, if it even exist in some measure, will be found to have occupied but little of the writer’s attention, and cannot, from the length of the narrative, be taken in at one view, by the reader.²

Six years earlier, therefore, than the 1842 declaration its chief features are already thought out.

During the intervening period, however, Poe varies in the interpretation of one essential of his theory. In the same year in which he alleges that the average novel cannot, from its extent, be regarded as a whole, he points out the peculiar unity of effect of Bulwer’s *Last Days of Pompeii*: “This justly admired work owes what it possesses of attraction for the mass, to the stupendousness of its leading event . . . to the skill with which the mind of the reader is prepared for this event.”³ In 1837 he praises, in a review of a novel, the “exceeding ingenuity and finish in the adaptation of its component parts” and adds that “nothing is wanting to a complete whole, and nothing is out of place, or out of time.”⁴ And in 1841 he condemns the absence of special unity in *Barnaby Rudge*, affirming

¹ I disregard one point of the final statement, namely the contention, generally accepted as an axiom in American criticism, that prose and not verse is the proper vehicle for brief fiction.

² IX, 46. Poe applies the term “brief article” without discrimination to such pieces as *The Black Veil*, which has genuine plot, and *The Pawnbroker’s Shop*, which has none. This fusion of what Dickens himself afterwards separates into Scenes, Characters, and Tales (cf. the preface to the 1850 edition) is interesting in the light of current opinion as to the interrelation of these forms (cf. Canby, *The Short Story in English* [New York, 1909], pp. 180–82). Elsewhere (XI, 110), Poe uses “article” as synonymous with “tale.”

³ IX, 153.

⁴ IX, 265.

that Dickens has not properly persisted in developing only "the soul of the plot" and that he has shown "no positive genius for adaptation."¹ Perhaps Poe does not choose to regard these as typical examples of extended fiction; in that case the inconsistency vanishes, for the initial (1836) criticism is applied only—although with no particular stress upon this point—to the "common novel." Be that as it may, here are three instances² where the critic measures a long story by his special standard. This tendency of Poe's to extend his narrative principle to all fiction has not, I believe, been sufficiently recognized.

A fourth instance includes a qualification which leads back toward the original attitude, but the conception remains less narrow. Poe writes of Bulwer's *Night and Morning* that the author has been so careful in "this working-up of his story—in this nice dovetailing of its constituent parts—that it is difficult to detect a blemish in any portion." Yet he holds that the tension has been too great, that the author has tried too hard, since "narratives, even one-fourth as long . . . are essentially inadapted to that nice and complex adjustment of incident at which he has made this desperate attempt."³ In thus reverting Poe takes the standpoint of the practical. Sustained effort (which according to the earlier statement required only perseverance) is disapproved because it is so difficult as frequently to be out of reach of both writer and reader.

Why this is so was precisely explained, in 1841, in the following remarks, on the nature of plot—remarks which, in so far as they reveal the mechanics of totality of effect, supplement to some purpose the 1842 doctrine:

The word *plot*, as commonly accepted, conveys but an indefinite meaning. Most persons think of it as a simple *complexity*; and into this error even so fine a critic as Augustus William Schlegel has obviously fallen, when he confounds its idea with that of the mere *intrigue* in which the Spanish dramas of Cervantes and Calderon abound. But the greatest involution of incident will not result in plot; which, properly defined, is *that in which no*

¹ XI, 57, 64.

² Cf. also the criticism of *Winifred* (see above, p. 195).

³ X, 119–22. Poe continues, making the point already suggested in 1836 about the desirability of presentation at a single sitting. He here speaks of "unity or totality of effect," meaning what he means in the 1836 brief-poem statement by "unity or totality of interest."

part can be displaced without ruin to the whole. It may be described as a building so dependently constructed, that to change the position of a single brick is to overthrow the entire fabric. In this definition and description, we of course refer only to that infinite perfection which the true artist bears ever in mind—that unattainable goal to which his eyes are always directed, but of the possibility of attaining which he still endeavors, if wise, to cheat himself into the belief. The reading world, however, is satisfied with a less rigid construction of the term. It is content to think that plot a good one, in which none of the leading incidents can be removed without detriment to the mass. Here indeed is a material difference; and in this view of the case the plot of "Night and Morning" is decidedly excellent. Speaking comparatively, and in regard to stories similarly composed, it is one of the best.¹

The interest of plot, referring, as it does, to cultivated thought in the reader, and appealing to considerations analogous with those which are the essence of the sculptural taste, is by no means a popular interest; although it has the peculiarity of being appreciated in its atoms by all, while in its totality of beauty it is comprehended but by the few. . . . A good tale may be written without it. Some of the finest fictions in the world have neglected it altogether. We see nothing of it in "Gil Blas," in the "Pilgrim's Progress," or in "Robinson Crusoe." Thus it is not an essential in storytelling at all; although, well managed, within proper limits, it is a thing to be desired.²

The proper limits, he here contends, would normally be those of the brief tale.³ But in general the assertion is not so sweeping as the earlier one, and it is to be observed that in the comment on perfection of plot Poe is speaking of fiction as a whole and not exclusively of the short story.

In the perpetually emphasized 1842 review the critic focuses his attention, it is evident, upon the special problem of the brief tale. One month after the Hawthorne criticism, however, its chief principle is again extended to the novel when Poe says of Bulwer's *Zanoni* that "the necessity of preserving the oneness and entireness of effect, of which we have spoken so much, exists in peculiar force in a highly imaginative work like this."⁴ In 1844 the nature of plot is discussed

¹ X, 116-17.

² X, 120-21.

³ Poe here states that the brief tale is "a species of composition which admits of the highest development of artistical power in alliance with the wildest vigour of imagination" (X, 122). Cf. the remark in the 1842 statement: "We have always regarded the Tale . . . as affording the best prose opportunity for display of the highest talent" (XI, 102).

⁴ XI, 120. In 1844 Poe, after enumerating the good qualities of Fouqué's *Undine*, refers to "the high artistical ability with which all are combined into a well-kept, well-motivated whole of absolute unity of effect" (XVI, 50).

in its most general terms, and once more in application to all fiction, as follows:

The pleasure which we derive from any exertion of human ingenuity, is in the direct ratio of the *approach* to this species of reciprocity between cause and effect. In the construction of *plot*, for example, in fictitious literature, we should aim at so arranging the points, or incidents, that we cannot distinctly see, in respect to any one of them, whether that one depends from any other, or upholds it. In this sense, of course, perfection of plot is unattainable *in fact*—because Man is the constructor. The plots of God are perfect. The Universe is a Plot of God.¹

The attainable in fact is mentioned briefly a year later in a discussion of the drama,² to which also Poe applies his theory.

It is manifest that plot, as he views it, is absolutely and singly essential to totality of effect, and that plot in this sense is by no means the monopoly of the brief tale. These are the outstanding features in the miscellaneous remarks, too often neglected, which complete the 1842 pronouncement.

Certain other bits of criticism are of interest because they suggest points generally accredited to other theorists. One of these anticipates Spielhagen. When Poe writes, in 1849, that "in the tale proper . . . there is no space for development of character,"³ he emphasizes a condition which the German critic, several decades later, declares the prime requisite for the *Novelle*.⁴ In a discussion of *Barnaby Rudge*, Poe applies the dramatic unities to fiction, as Professor Matthews has since done⁵ in the case of the short story.

The effect of the present narrative might have been materially increased by confining the action within the limits of London. The "Notre Dame" of Hugo affords a fine example of the force which can be gained by concentration, or unity of place. The unity of time is also sadly neglected, to no purpose.⁶

¹ XVI, 10. These remarks are reproduced in *Eureka* (XVI, 292; cf. XVI, 306).

² XIII, 44-45. Cf. the remarks on plot published in 1845 in *A Chapter of Suggestions* (XIV, 188-89). Here Poe reiterates points already made.

³ XVI, 171. Poe adds, reverting in some degree to the 1842 view, that in the tale "mere construction is, of course, far more imperatively demanded than in the novel."

⁴ *Beiträge zur Theorie und Technik des Romans* (Leipzig, 1883), p. 245. Cf. two articles in *Modern Language Notes*: "Edgar Allan Poe and Friedrich Spielhagen. Their Theory of the Short Story," March, 1910; "Poe and Spielhagen; Novelle and Short-Story," February, 1914. In the first Professor Cobb maintains that Spielhagen accepted and exploited in Germany Poe's theory of the story; in the second Professor Mitchell very justly refutes this view. Neither refers to the remark of Poe here quoted.

⁵ *The Philosophy of the Short-Story* (New York, 1912), pp. 15-16.

⁶ XI, 59.

In the same review he remarks upon what has since become one of the most frequently used devices of the short-story adept, the deliberate and repeated insertion of forward-pointing remarks destined to emphasize the singleness of effect. Dickens, he believes, should have employed it:

The raven, too, intensely amusing as it is, might have been made, more than we now see it, a portion of the conception of the fantastic Barnaby. Its croakings might have been *prophetically* heard in the course of the drama. Its character might have performed, in regard to that of the idiot, much the same part as does, in music, the accompaniment in respect to the air. Each might have been distinct. Each might have differed remarkably from the other. Yet between them there might have been wrought an analogical resemblance, and although each might have existed apart, they might have formed together a whole which would have been imperfect in the absence of either.¹

And here once more is the principle of totality of effect applied not to the brief tale but to the novel.²

This frequent extension of the doctrine constitutes a fresh piece of evidence as to the interplay of influences between the short and long fiction forms. Investigation of the genesis of modern brief narrative has repeatedly shown instances where the gap between the two forms has been bridged, in actual practice, by tales that approach the short story, or the *Novelle*, or the *conte* and *nouvelle*, but remain "long short-stories" or condensed novels.³ Contemporary criticism, in the early stages, rarely sensed the relationship. But Poe is explicit. A statement by which he may very possibly have been influenced appears in the preface (1832) of William Godwin's *Caleb Williams*:

I felt that I had a great advantage in thus carrying back my invention from the ultimate conclusion to the first commencement of the train of

¹ XI, 63.

² One other item suggestive of another theorist may be listed. Poe writes of a novel: "The general plot or narrative is a mere thread upon which the after-dinner anecdotes . . . are strung with about as much method . . . as we see urchins employ in stringing the kernels of nuts" (XI, 92). No doubt the figure has been imagined, in this application, a thousand times, but it is of interest that the same principle is applied with the same illustration by Marmontel in his pioneer definition of the *conte* (although Marmontel objects to this characteristic specifically in the *conte* and not in the *roman*). Cf. *Nouveau Dictionnaire pour servir de supplément aux dictionnaires des sciences*, etc. (Paris, 1776), II, 569. Poe refers several times to Marmontel (IV, 193; XII, 223; XIV, 46), but not to his article on the *conte*.

³ Cf. Canby, *The Short Story* (New York, 1902), p. 21; Mitchell, *Heyse and His Predecessors in the Theory of the Novelle* (Frankfurt, 1915), p. 30; Smith, "Balzac and the Short-Story," *Modern Philology*, XII (December, 1914), 84.

adventures upon which I purposed to employ my pen. An entire unity of plot would be the infallible result; and the unity of spirit and interest in a tale truly considered gives it a powerful hold on the reader which can scarcely be generated with equal success in any other way.¹

Poe expresses his approval of *Caleb Williams*,² and commends the American novel, *George Balcombe*, for being planned in a similar manner.³

The consequences of such a conception of totality of effect may be far-reaching. Has there not been since Poe—I would not suggest any direct influence—a tendency to apply to novel construction his special standard of unity? Consider such artists as James, Bourget, Dostoevski, such novels as *The American*, *Le Démon de midi*, *Crime and Punishment*. In each of these books attention is focused, somewhat sharply, upon a single narrative idea. James explains the conception of *The American* as follows:

I recall that I was seated in an American "horse-car" when I found myself, of a sudden, considering with enthusiasm, as the theme of a "story," the situation, in another country and an aristocratic society, of some robust but insidiously beguiled and betrayed, some cruelly wronged, compatriot: the point being in especial that he should suffer at the hands of persons pretending to represent the highest possible civilisation and to be of an order in every way superior to his own. What would he "do" in that predicament, how would he right himself, or how, failing a remedy, would he conduct himself under his wrong? This would be the question involved, and I remember well how, having entered the horse-car without a dream of it, I was presently to leave that vehicle in full possession of my answer. He would behave in the most interesting manner—it would all depend on that: stricken, smarting, sore, he would arrive at his just vindication and then would fail of all triumphantly and all vulgarly enjoying it. He would hold his revenge and cherish it and feel its sweetness, and then in the very act of forcing it home would sacrifice it in disgust. He would let them go, in short, his haughty contemnners, even while feeling them, with joy, in his power, and he would obey, in so doing, one of the large and easy impulses generally characteristic of his type.⁴

¹ I quote from the edition of London, Routledge, 1903.

² XI, 64; XIV, 193.

³ IX, 265. Balzac, a pioneer in modern French brief narrative as well as in other fields, is enthusiastic in his praise of the unity of *Caleb Williams* (*Annette et le criminel* [Paris, 1824], I, 15-16; this preface is reprinted by Lovenjoul, *Histoire des œuvres de Balzac*, 450-53).

⁴ *Novels and Tales of Henry James* (New York edition), II, Preface, vi-vii.

Bourget writes, more succinctly, of *Le Démon de midi*:

J'entrevis comme un thème possible à un roman d'analyse, cette douloureuse dualité: de hautes certitudes religieuses coexistant, chez un homme public, avec les pires égarements de la passion.¹

Neither man ever forgets the business at hand; each unfolds the results of one situation and then stops.² A parallel recently drawn between Dostoevski's titanic work and a famous short story emphasizes the same structural characteristic. Professor Knowlton, in an article on *A Russian Influence on Stevenson*, affirms:

Stevenson's *Markheim* is a Dostoevski's *Crime and Punishment* on a greatly reduced scale, a cameo version of a colossal frieze. Both are stories beginning with the murder of a pawnbroker and ending, after an experience of highly crowded mental life, with the self-surrender of the murderer to the police. When we compare the short story and the novel, we perceive at once the literary relationship between the two in method and in theme.³

Examples of this procedure among modern novelists might be multiplied. These men could hardly be aware of the scattered criticisms of Poe, who would be represented for them, at most, by his 1842 review; yet his theory sharply foreshadows their practice.

HORATIO E. SMITH

YALE UNIVERSITY

¹ *Le Démon de midi* (Paris, 1914), Dédicace, iii.

² Concerning the method of Henry James, cf. the *N. Y. Nation*, April 15, 1917, p. 398. As to the distinction which, in spite of the similarity between these long and short stories, remains, cf. the remark by James himself, in the Preface to *Roderick Hudson* (N. Y. edition, p. vi).

³ *Modern Philology*, XIV (December, 1916), 65. De Vogüé writes of this novel in a similar vein, adding that the method is essentially Western (*Le Roman russe*, Paris, 1886, p. 247).



LAURENCE STERNE AND THÉOPHILE GAUTIER¹

It is needless to demonstrate that Théophile Gautier was thoroughly familiar with *Tristram Shandy* and its clergyman author, for numerous references to incidents in that production are scattered throughout his collected works. It is almost as evident to anyone familiar with Gautier why "Pauvre Théo," as he so frequently styled himself, was attracted to the eccentric English divine. First of all, Gautier was steeped in Rabelais,² that unavowed inspirer of Sterne, and, according to Maxime du Camp,³ could quote entire chapters from him. With Sterne, he possessed an inbred hatred for the commonplace and took keen delight in scandalizing the unsuspecting bourgeois, now by the extravagant demonstration at the *première d'Hernani*, now by the impertinent *Mlle de Maupin*. Finally, in falling under the spell of *Tristram*, Gautier was merely following the example of Xavier de Maistre, Nodier,⁴ Hugo, de Vigny, Balzac, and other lesser romanticists who had read and admired him.

The influence of Sterne manifests itself very early in Gautier's works. *Albertus*, published in 1833, when the poet was but twenty-two years old, contains a rather maladroit versification of the famous passage in *Tristram Shandy*⁵ relative to the tear that the Recording Angel lets fall to blot out from his records an oath of simple Uncle Toby.

Il était ainsi fait—singulière nature!
Son âme, qu'il niait, cependant était pure;
—Il voulait le néant et n'aurait rien gagné
A la suppression de l'enfer.—Homme étrange!
Il avait les vertus qu'il riait, et l'ange

¹ Professor Charles Sears Baldwin treated briefly this subject in his article, "The Literary Influence of Sterne in France," in the *Modern Language Publications*, XVII, 2.

² Traces of Rabelaisian influence may also be observed intermingled with that of Sterne, especially in *Les Jeunes-France*. I have purposely avoided such passages and confined myself to those which seem to me to have been inspired by Poor Yorick. It is significant to note in this connection that almost every volume of Gautier's in which a reflection of Sterne's style may be detected contains references to incidents in *Tristram Shandy* and snatches of phrases almost literally translated from that production.

³ *Théophile Gautier* (Paris: Hachette, 1905), p. 20.

⁴ Cf. the author's article, "Sterne and Nodier," in *Modern Philology*, August, 1916.

⁵ *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. VI, chap. viii.

Qui là-haut sur son livre écrivait indigné
 Une grosse hérésie, un sophisme damnable,
 Venant à l'action, le trouvait moins coupable,
 Et pesant dans sa main le bien avec le mal,
 Pour cette fois encor retenait l'anathème.
 —Une larme tombée à l'endroit du blasphème
 L'effaçait du feuillet fatal.¹

The imitation in this case is certainly deliberate, as the incident is awkwardly arranged and gives the impression of having been dragged into the poem without rhyme or reason.

Gautier seems to have been greatly impressed by this passage, for he almost surely had it in mind when he wrote later, in *Mlle de Maupin*:

J'ai dans une urne de cristal quelques larmes que j'ai recueillies au moment où elles allaient tomber. Voilà mon écrin et mes diamants, et je les présenterai à l'ange qui me viendra prendre pour m'emmenner à Dieu.²

This is not the only evidence in *Albertus* of Gautier's fondness for Sterne. The poet assumes in several instances that flippant attitude toward the reader which is so frequent with Sterne and which we shall have further occasion to note in Gautier's subsequent works. The concluding lines of the poem are typical:

J'aurais pu clairement expliquer chaque chose,
 Clouer à chaque mot une savante glose.—
 Je vous crois, cher lecteur, assez spirituel
 Pour me comprendre.—Ainsi, bon soir. Fermez la porte,
 Donnez-moi la pincette, et dites qu'on m'apporte
 Un tome de *Pantagruel*.³

The Shandean influence is much more pronounced in *Les Jeunes-France*, which appeared also in 1833. This amusing satire directed against the extravagances committed in the name of romanticism is a sustained imitation of the haphazard, digressive, and pert manner of Tristram. "Mon digne ami," exclaims Roderick in the first episode, paraphrasing Sterne, "je ne sais pas à quoi ton père et ta mère pensaient en te faisant, mais certainement ils pensaient à autre chose."⁴

¹ *Poésies complètes* (Paris: Charpentier, 1905), I, 160.

² *Mlle de Maupin* (Paris: Charpentier, 1904), p. 173. Another and longer elaboration of this same theme will be found in the seventeenth scene of *Une Larme du Diable*.

³ *Poésies complètes*, I, 184.

⁴ Cf. *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. I, chap. 1.

Whatever may have occupied the minds of the worthy couple in question, Théophile was certainly thinking of Tristram, and to the eccentricities of Tristram he continually reverts from the first page of his bizarre preface, "which saves the reader from perusing three or four more or less fantastic tales," to the last story of the collection, in which he treats us to a digression of seven or eight pages just to prove to us that he really can write a good description. In the intervening pages he has used nearly all of Sterne's idiosyncrasies of style. There are frequent comments on the author's treatment of the various episodes. He tells us why this incident has been arranged in dialogue; that a fine dissertation might conveniently be introduced at a given point in his story; that he could have done this or that thing had he so desired; and that material which he has previously discarded would now be of great service to him in accounting for a certain page that he has been racking his brains to fill. Or perhaps he grows weary and intimates that he must rest his lips, "qui depuis trois cents pages se tordent en ricanements sardoniques." Frequently he bullies or mystifies the reader. Your opinion of this tale is not favorable? "Prenez-la ou laissez-la, je me couperais la gorge plutôt que de mentir d'une syllabe." You are wondering how he is going to extricate himself from an awkward predicament? "Voilà une superbe explication, à laquelle vous ne vous attendiez guère, garde nationale de lecteur que vous êtes." You blush already as you foresee a rather delicate situation. Gautier escorts you from the room to spare you an embarrassing scene. You are deeply interested in a discussion that has been started. All very well. But Gautier has tired of it and bids you continue it with Rodolphe if you so desire. These vagaries of style and others of a similar nature indicate rather clearly that the "rosse qui le sert de Pégase" bears a striking resemblance to Tristram's hobbyhorse.

There are also in *Les Jeunes-France* several cases of deliberate borrowing, two of which may be mentioned. The first of these appropriations is from the Widow Wadman's courtship of Uncle Toby, the episode in which the widow almost brings about Toby's downfall by allowing her hand to rest lightly against his as they study together the map of the Flanders' campaign.¹ This incident is

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. VII, chap. xvi.

developed at some length in "Celle-ci et celle-là,"¹ but the adaptation is too long and too licentious to be quoted here. In the same sketch Gautier records a dialogue without explanatory comment, "laissant à l'intelligence exercée de mes lectrices le soin de deviner quelles circonstances ont donné lieu aux demandes et aux réponses."² This is merely the converse of the procedure employed by Sterne in the twentieth chapter of the eighth volume of *Tristram*.

In the "Contes humoristiques,"³ in addition to further oddities of style and an exposition of the elder Shandy's theory of given names,⁴ we encounter a new phase of Sterne's influence in certain lyric and sentimental passages that are almost unique in Gautier and smack strongly of the *Sentimental Journey*. Who other than poor Maria of Moulines could have inspired such an effusion as the following?

Pardonne, ô Maria! je n'ai pu, jusqu'à présent, faire le voyage; mais j'irai, je chercherai la place; pour la découvrir j'interrogerai les inscriptions de toutes les croix, et quand je l'aurai trouvée, je me mettrai à genou, je prierai longtemps, afin que ton ombre soit consolée; je jetterai sur la pierre, verte de mousse, tant de guirlandes blanches et de fleurs d'oranger, que ta fosse semblera une corbeille de mariage.⁵

And who could find tears to shed over the fate of a poor cricket,⁶ if he had not first felt the touching appeal of Toby's observation to the fly, "The world is big enough for thee and me."⁷ It may be added that an allusion to this incident in *Tristram* precludes any doubt as to the source of this passage. Vaguely reminiscent also of Sterne are several poetic reveries on the irrevocable flight of time.⁸

This aspect of Sterne's genius seems, however, to have interested Gautier but little, as I have found but one other trace of sentimentality of this sort in his writings. This occurs in *Le Capitaine Fracasse*, where, in the account of Sigognac's parting from his cat and dog, there is much ado about a blessed tear falling from weeping eye.⁹

¹ Cf. *Les Jeunes-France* (Paris: Charpentier, s.d.), pp. 135 ff.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 145 ff.

³ Published separately in various periodicals from 1831 to 1844. They appear under the title cited at the end of *Les Jeunes-France* in the edition of 1873 and in all subsequent editions.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 346-47. Cf. *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. I, chap. xix.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 277.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

⁷ Cf. *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. VI, chap. vii.

⁸ *Les Jeunes-France*, pp. 277, 279, 306. Cf. *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. IX, chap. viii.

⁹ *Le Capitaine Fracasse* (Paris: Charpentier, 1905), I, 72-73. Variations of the same incident recur several times in the novel.

Gautier has left us many narratives of his travels. One of the earliest and least known of these journeys, "Le Tour en Belgique,"¹ is decidedly reminiscent of Yorick's wanderings. Nothing could be more haphazard than this jaunt into Belgium and the incidents and opinions that the author jots down for our edification. The minor happenings incidental to the departure are chronicled in order until the writer falls asleep and leaves us to fill in the resulting gap to suit our own fancies. The places that he visits are treated in rather summary fashion, but no occasion is lost to tell us about a demented beggar woman whom he meets, the trouble that he encounters in getting a cup of coffee or a glass of beer, and the enjoyment that a performance of *Polichinelle* affords him. Now he stops his tale to call our attention to the progress that he has made; now he sets apart a chapter to explain his antipathy for railroads. One digression follows another, the climax being reached in a long paragraph that begins "A propos de chiens," and ends with a comment on windmills involving Raphael. There is no borrowing of incident in this amusing narrative, but the method is certainly that of Yorick. "Pochades, zigzags et paradoxes"² are in much the same vein, except that they contain few if any of the Shandean mannerisms. Only the digressive style and the trivialness of many of the incidents recall Sterne.

This completes the list of Gautier's works in which there is a sustained effort to imitate the style of *Tristram*. But there is one trick of Sterne's that the French novelist has made his own and that he uses with more or less frequency in much of his prose fiction. This is his practice of intruding himself into his stories, of stopping his tale to banter the reader or to point out that the hero is a personage of his own creation, whose destinies he controls and with whom he may take such liberties as he pleases. It would take too long to cite all of these interruptions, but three or four may be mentioned.

The sixteenth scene of *Une Larme du Diable*³ furnishes a striking example. The play is suspended without warning, and Gautier in person proceeds in this manner: "Je vous avouerai que voici bien longtemps que je fais parler les autres et que je serais fort aise de

¹ In *Caprices et zigzags* (Paris: Charpentier, s.d.).

² *Ibid.*

³ *Théâtre* (Paris: Charpentier, 1877), pp. 46-48.

trouver jour à placer convenablement mon petit mot." This "petit mot" consists of a somewhat lengthy interpretation of the significance of the play and an appeal for the reader's indulgence in judging the remaining scenes. This said, the author retires from the stage and the play goes on. Sterne's dedicatory epistle inserted in the middle of the first volume of *Tristram Shandy* is not more pleasingly *mal à propos*.

In *Mlle de Maupin* we note among other asides this piece of flippancy: "Le lecteur en pensera ce qu'il voudra; ce sont de simples conjectures que nous lui proposons; nous n'en savons pas là-dessus plus que lui . . ." etc.

The *Nouvelles* are rich in similar *boutades*, especially *Fortunio*, in at least ten chapters of which Gautier deems it necessary to suspend his narrative to chat with the reader or to make a complacent remark about his skill or lack of skill in handling the intrigue. The last four pages of the twelfth chapter should be read in this connection. The following shorter passage from the fifth chapter is however quite as typical.

Musidora is disappointed in finding no information concerning Fortunio in a certain portfolio belonging to him that has fallen into her hands:

Musidora est assurément fort contrariée, mais nous le sommes bien autant qu'elle. Nous comptions beaucoup sur le portefeuille pour donner à nos lecteurs (qu'on nous pardonne cet amour-propre) des renseignements exacts sur ce problématique personnage. Nous espérions qu'il y aurait dans ce portefeuille des lettres d'amour, des plans de tragédies, des romans en deux volumes et autres, ou tout au moins des cartes de visite, ainsi que cela doit être dans le portefeuille de tout héros un peu bien situé. Notre embarras est cruel. . . .

It suddenly occurs to Gautier that he might choose another hero.

Nous avons bien envie de le laisser là. Si nous prenions George à sa place?

Bah! Il a l'abominable habitude de se griser matin et soir et quelquefois dans la journée, et aussi un peu dans la nuit. Que diriez-vous, Madame, d'un héros qui serait toujours ivre, et qui parlerait deux heures sur la différence de l'aile droite et de l'aile gauche de la perdrix?

—Et Alfred?

—Il est trop bête.

—Et de Marcilly?

—Il ne l'est pas assez.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 62.

Nous garderons donc Fortunio faute de mieux: les premières nouvelles que nous en aurons, nous vous les ferons savoir aussitôt.—Entrons donc dans la salle de bain de Musidora.¹

Even from this cursory survey of Sterne's influence upon Gautier it is evident that it was not the sentimentality nor even the humor of Sterne that appealed to the French novelist, but his surprising and original style. This observation in itself suffices to explain why Gautier was drawn to imitate deliberately the English humorist. Gautier was above all an artist, interested in the form rather than in the subject-matter of literature. An eager student of the various forms of literary expression, he frequently in his gropings to perfect his own style reverted to authors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and essayed to reproduce their manners. *Jean et Jeanette*,² for instance, is a sympathetic and successful rendering in short-story form of *Le Jeu de l'amour et du hasard*, with much of the grace and delicate humor that we associate with Marivaux. *Le Capitaine Fracasse* is essentially an evocation of seventeenth-century life, as seen through the eyes of Scarron. And *Le petit chien de la Marquise* is, in the novelist's own words, an attempt "de donner l'idée d'un style et d'une manière tout à fait tombés dans l'oubli."³ Here then lies the explanation of Gautier's dallying with Sterne. *Tristram* suggested to him an experiment in literary expression and aroused in him the desire to see what effects he could produce with instruments that Sterne had used with such marked success. He experimented therefore with this alluring but artificial style, and when he had exhausted its possibilities for him he passed on to something else.

How important is the influence of Sterne upon Gautier? Should it be considered seriously in any estimate of his works? Gautier remarks a propos of one of his digressions in *Fortunio* that the passage may seem to some of his readers to be a hors d'oeuvre and that he is entirely of that opinion.⁴ If we except *Les Jeunes-France*, which adds little or nothing to its author's reputation, we may borrow

¹ *Nouvelles* (Paris: Charpentier, 1904), pp. 45-48.

² In *Un Trio de Romans* (Paris: Charpentier, 1888).

³ *Nouvelles*, p. 251. It is significant to note that *Le petit chien de la Marquise* was first published in 1836; that is, during the period when Gautier was experimenting with Sterne.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 251. This aside upon the value of digressions is a reminiscence of a similar observation in *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. I, chap. xxii.

Gautier's own term to express the literary importance of those portions of his stories that Sterne may have inspired. They are *hors d'oeuvre*—nothing more. Interesting and diverting they assuredly are, but the great majority of them might readily be eliminated without detriment to the productions in which they occur. The qualities upon which Gautier's fame rests lie elsewhere and no one of them can be said to have been acquired or even perfected by his study of Laurence Sterne.

F. B. BARTON

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Elizabethan Translations from the Italian. By MARY AUGUSTA SCOTT.
Vassar Semi-Centennial Series. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916. Pp. lxxxi+558.

Miss Scott's bibliography, *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian*, is a reprint of the articles contributed by her to *Publications of the Modern Language Association* from 1895 to 1899, supplemented by a large number of new items, with an introduction on the Italian Renaissance in England, and a copious index. This completion of the labor of many years in the field furnishes students of Elizabethan literature a valuable reference work. Many out-of-the-way items have been gathered, and, as far as the data are complete, the bibliographical and literary details as well as the titles seem to be given with accuracy.

Because of some very serious gaps, however, it is difficult to accord the volume the praise that much of the work deserves. Though according to Miss Scott "all sources of information are given in the notes" (p. xv), many important articles and books of recent years dealing with phases of the Italian influence are not mentioned. Often an old work is cited instead of a more recent and authoritative one, while references to the research journals are rare. The omissions resulting from this failure to follow the literature of the field are often serious.

But to my mind the most inexplicable hiatus in the work is the failure to include Wyatt and Surrey's poems or Tottel's *Miscellany*. The omission is not due to the exclusion of writers belonging to the period preceding Elizabeth's reign, for Lydgate's *Troy Book*, published in 1555, heads the section called "Metrical Romances" on account of its relation to Guido delle Colonne. How completely the real pioneers of the Italian movement are passed over by Miss Scott is seen in a statement in the Introduction (p. xl): "The Italian literary conquest of England during the sixteenth century was led by the story-tellers and poets, first made known to the Elizabethans mainly through William Painter's *The Palace of Pleasure* (1566-67) and Thomas Watson's *Passionate Centurie of Love* (1582)." The appearance of Spenser's translations from Petrarch in *The Theatre of Voluptuous Worldlings*, 1569, is noted only under the *Complaints*, 1591. Howell's "Certain Verses translated out of Petrarch, concerning Rome, written by him many yeares since," found in *Devises*, 1580, is not included in Miss Scott's list.

Another unfortunate omission concerns works of Aretine and Machiavelli that should be included under the section "Italian and Latin Publications in England," particularly as Aretine, whose ill name and fame permeate Elizabethan literature, is not treated in the record of Italian influence. Some years ago, in an article in *Modern Language Notes* (XXII, 2-6, 129-35) entitled "All of the Five Fictitious Italian Editions of Writings of Machiavelli and Three of Those of Pietro Aretino Printed by John Wolfe of London (1584-1588)," Gerber presented evidence showing that works of both writers found publication in England. But, aside from the definite evidence of the Stationers' Register quoted by Gerber, Miss Scott had sufficient reason to investigate Wolfe's activities, for she herself quotes Cockle's surmise (pp. 306-7, from *A Bibliography of English Military Books*, p. 135) that an Italian edition of Machiavelli's *Art of War* with the legend "Palermo, A. Antonelli, 1587" was "probably printed secretly in London by John Wolfe before 28 Jan. 1584." It is quite clear, however, that, though Miss Scott quotes from the Register in certain instances, its valuable evidence has not been systematically used.

A bibliography of so broad scope might also have included such items as Gascoigne's translation of *Hemetes the Heremite* into Italian, and *Palestina*, "Written by M^r. R[obert]. C[hambers]. P. and Bachelor of Diuinitie. B. Sermartelli, Florence. [London?] 1600" (cf. Esdaile, *English Tales and Romances*, pp. 77, 35).

For the madrigal collections Miss Scott seems to have relied largely on Oliphant's *La Musa Madrigalesca*, while Bolle's *Die gedruckten englischen Liederbücher bis 1600* (*Palaestra*, XXIX), 1903, was apparently unknown to her. Bolle points out that No. XXIX of Byrd's *Psalms, sonets, and songs of sadness and pietie*, 1587—the first of the madrigal collections, but omitted by Miss Scott—is from Orlando di Lasso. Several other collections not listed by her are shown by Bolle to have borrowed from earlier collections which drew from Italian sources. For her items numbered 88, 95, 96, 97, 99, and 105, Miss Scott might have found in Bolle's book details as to Italian sources of individual madrigals, supplementing or correcting those taken by her from Oliphant or older writers. Naturally, also, in listing the modern reprints of the madrigal collections she fails to indicate the fact that Bolle reprinted a number of those earlier than 1600, particularly such madrigals or collections as were not already accessible in modern reprints. Thus Miss Scott merely refers to *The British Bibliographer*, I, 344-45, for a few of the songs in Morley's *Canzonets*, 1597, but the entire collection is reprinted by Bolle. For Thomas Watson's *The first sett of Italian Madrigalls Englished*, 1590, Miss Scott prints a few scattering madrigals, chiefly from Oliphant. Both F. I. Carpenter, however, in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* (II, 321-58), and Bolle (pp. 41 ff.) print all of these madrigals and their Italian originals.

The section "Romances in Prose" I have compared, by no means exhaustively, with Esdaile's *English Tales and Romances*, 1912. There are many cases in which Esdaile gives bibliographical details supplementing Miss Scott's of which she is unaware or which she ignores without explanation. For example, for Miss Scott's No. 6, *The Historie of Aurelio and of Isabell*; 9, Boccaccio's *Philocopo*; 36, *The Cobler of Caunterburie*; 50, *The Honour of Chivalrie*; 55, *Patient Grisel*; 62, *Decameron*; and 69, *The Fortunate, the Deceived, and the Unfortunate Lovers*, Esdaile lists English editions or versions that are not noticed by Miss Scott. In the case of *The Forrest of Fancy* (No. 24), Esdaile conjectures that the two supposedly distinct editions of 1579 are really one. *Foure Straunge, lamentable, and Tragicall Hystories* (No. 21) by R.S., Esdaile assigns to Robert Smyth, and the anonymous *Hipolito and Isabella* (No. 64) to Alexander Hart. So far as I have noted, however, no work of Esdaile's list for which Italian sources have been pointed out is omitted by Miss Scott. Some works she has included merely because their Italian color or setting suggests Italian influences, and the following additional titles which may reflect Italian sources are recorded by Esdaile: *The strange aduentour of two Italian Knights*, entered on the Stationers' Register 19 April, 1577; Antony Munday, *Zelauto . . . Containig a Delicate Disputation, gallantly discoursed betweene two noble Gentlemen of Italye*, 1580; Henry Roberts, *A Defiance to Fortune . . . Whereunto is adiointed the honorable Warres of Galastino, Duke of Millaine*, 1590; J.S., *Clidamas, or the Sicilian Tale*, entered on the Register 25 February, 1636/7. On the other hand, Miss Scott's list contains several works not mentioned by Esdaile. Those important for prose fiction, if their existence is established, are the lost *Life of Sir Meliado* (No. 15); *Tarletons Tragical Treatises* (No. 23); and *The Tragical historie of Romeus and Iuliet* (No. 31). Some other differences in the lists of the two bibliographers are evidently due to difference in classification, and variation is to be expected here in view of the many hybrid types in Elizabethan fiction.

The one fixed type of fiction, however, as far as the Italian influence is concerned, was the novella, and one feels that Miss Scott's classification should take into account the distinctness of the type. Most of the works of pure fiction included in *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian* are drawn from novelle. The metrical romances of the Middle Ages, indeed, were so entirely discredited among the cultured, to whom Italian literature appealed chiefly, that Miss Scott's heading "Metrical Romances" for the section dealing with verse tales seems ill chosen. Further, the sections of the book should have been so arranged that the prose would follow immediately on the verse tales. Most of the translations of Boccaccio and Bandello were rendered in verse at first, no doubt on account of the classical leanings of the age, which found in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* the model for story-telling. During the period of uncertainty in regard to the correct basis for English

meter, prose gained the ascendancy, particularly in collections of novelle translated from Italian prose. Turbervile's *Tragical Tales* is all in verse, but a little later Pettie's collection of classical tales was given prose form. The transition is seen in the use of both verse and prose for two of the collections grouped by Miss Scott under "Romances in Prose": Whetstone's *Rock of Regard*, 1576, and Gifford's *Posie of Gilloflowers*, 1580. *Tarletons Tragical Treatises* (No. 23), 1578, unknown to me, is according to the title "both in Prose and Verse." Whetstone's *Heptameron of Ciuill Discourses*, 1582, has poems interspersed with the prose tales.

Another important phase of the influence of the novella—one in which Miss Scott's work shows at its best—is represented by the lists of plays drawn from the various Elizabethan collections of tales. The lists, however, are scattered, and the cross-references insufficient. The titles of all plays drawn from the translations of Italian novelle should, I think, be assembled at the end of the section devoted to plays with direct Italian sources.

I add from my own random studies in the field a few further comments on "Romances in Prose," following Miss Scott's system of numbers.

8. Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*.—Painter's derivation of Bandello's stories from the French version of the *Histoires Tragiques* is not indicated. All Italian sources for Painter's stories should be given in order that the treatment be consistent with that of other collections discussed. Miss Scott has substituted her list of plays drawn from Painter's stories.

10. Fenton's *Tragicall Discourses*.—Discourse I is not "a translation of Ilicino's celebrated novella" but of the Belleforest translation of Bandello's version. Ford in *The Broken Heart* seems to have been indebted to the second discourse, the story of Livio and Camilla. Cf. *Modern Language Notes*, XXVIII, 51-52.

19. *A Petite Pallace of Pettie his pleasure*.—Miss Scott, though she pronounces all the stories classical, includes this collection apparently because Cephalus and Procris are "both of the Duke of Venice's court." It is possible, however, that the vogue of the first story, "Sinorix and Camma," in England for more than a decade was due to its appearance in *The Courtier*, translated by Hoby in 1561 (edition of Raleigh, pp. 236-37). In 1569/70 the story was twice entered on the Stationers' Register as a ballad, first as a "ballett intituled *sinorex Cania et Sinatus*" and second as a "ballett intituled *the Revenge yat a Woman of Grece toke of hym that slewe hyr husbounde*" (Arber's *Transcript*, I, 414, 416). Probably one of these forms appears in the ballad-like version "A straunge historie" in Gifford's *Posie of Gilloflowers* (Grosart, *Occasional Issues*, I, 128-31).

25. Gifford's *Posie of Gilloflowers*.—The difficulty sometimes encountered of determining direct Italian influence is illustrated here. Gifford's use of Italian names and his references to Italian sources indicate a strong influence of Italy. In some cases, however, it is possible that he drew his material

from ballad, farce, or jest-book, adding an Italian color because of the vogue of the Italianate. The ballad origin of "A straunge historie" has just been suggested. Miss Scott cites from the jest-books parallels to "Maister Gasparinus," and the story finds a further parallel in Ayrer's "Von etlichen nährischen Reden des Claus Narrn," etc., a work possibly derived from an English jig. A late jest-book version of "The Florentines and the Citizens of Bergamaske" and two variants of a related tale from tradition are given in *The Folk-Lore Record* (II, 173-76, and III, 127-29). "Of one that hyred a foolish seruant" is the same story as the first part of Ayrer's "Der engelendische Jann Posset," which is again probably an English jig revamped; cf. Bolte, *Singspiele der Englischen Komödianten*, p. 14, for parallels in jest-book and farce. Gifford's "A merry iest" is a version of the widespread story of a scholar journeying to paradise, found in Ayrer's singspiel "Der Forster im Schmaltzkübel"; cf. Bolte, p. 15, and *Folk Fellows Communications*.

27. *Rich his Farewell to Militarie Profession*.—There are a number of minor errors in the list of plays drawn from this collection. *Laelia* is not included among the parallels to the "Apolonius and Silla" story. Reference to "three Italian *Inganni* comedies" is misleading, as one of the three bears the title *GI'Ingannati*. There is no mention of Shirley's use of "Philotus and Emilia" in *Love Tricks* (cf. *Modern Language Notes*, XXIV, 100-101). The Scotch play *Philotus*, ascribed here to David Lyndsay, was in all probability written long after Sir David Lyndsay's death in 1555. *The Devil is an Ass* was printed in 1631, not 1641, though it was bound into the Folio completed in 1641.

28. *Rich's Don Simonides*.—This work is included because Warton believed that he had seen an Italian original. Becker has traced the plan of the book and part of the plot to Contreras, *Silva de aventuras* (cf. "The Adventure of Don Simonides," ein Roman von Barnabe Rich und seine Quelle" in Herrig's *Archiv*, 131, 64-80). A story which according to Becker's division is worked into the third part is related to Bandello, IV, 7.

48. Montemayor's *Diana*, translated by Yong.—No statement is made of the relation of *Diana* to Italian pastoral romance.

62. *Decameron*.—Some corrections might be made in the list of plays derived from Boccaccio's tales. I see no connection of Sharpham's *Fleire* with III, 3. John Phillip's *Patient Grissell* is omitted from the plays dealing with the Patient Grissell theme. For X, 4, Lee (*The Decameron, Its Sources and Analogues*, p. 314) lists Leigh Hunt's *The Legend of Florence*. Several jigs from Boccaccio's tales might be included. "Singing Simpkin," before 1620, is from VII, 6. From VII, 7, come "Rowlandes Godsonne," 1592, and the farce *Politick Whore; or Conceited Cuckold*, published in *The Muse of Newmarket*, 1580. The jigs, however, are little known. Miss Scott shows clearly by a remark on page 1 her failure to understand that the dramatic jig was in pure dialogue, but sung and danced as it was acted.

161. *Titus and Gisippus*.—This is not listed under "Romances in Prose," but the first translation of the story into English, by Elyot, was in prose. Goldsmith's story of Alcander and Septimius in *The Bee* is scarcely so important a variant as some Elizabethan stories. Closely related to *Titus and Gisippus* is *The notable hystory of two faithful lovers named Alfagus and Archelaus. Whearein is declared the true fygyure of Amytie and Freyndshypp. . . . Translated into English meeter*, 1574, by Edward Ienynge (cf. Corser, *Collectanea*, Part 8, pp. 303-8). Another variant, *Alexander and Lodowick*, surviving in a ballad, was dramatized for Henslowe (cf. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, II, 182). Lee, *Decameron*, pp. 339 f., describes a third variant, the ballad "Alphonso and Ganselo," in T. Deloney's *Garland of Goodwill*. The *Titus and Gisippus* story probably influenced Lyly in *Euphues* (cf. *Modern Philology*, VII, 577-85), but Miss Scott has not included *Euphues* in her bibliography.

C. R. BASKERVILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Miscellanea Hibernica. By KUNO MEYER. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. II, No. 4, November, 1916. Pp. 55.

Aside from Professor Cox's "Middle Irish Fragment of Bede's Ecclesiastical History" (*Studies in Honor of J. M. Hart* [New York, 1910], pp. 122-78), Rev. G. W. Hoey's *Irish Homily on the Passion* (Baltimore, 1911), and Rev. J. A. Geary's *Five Irish Homilies from the Rennes MS* (Washington, D.C., 1912), Dr. Meyer's *Miscellanea Hibernica* constitutes the most extensive body of purely linguistic Celtic material which has yet emanated from an American press.¹

The *Miscellanea Hibernica* consists of a series of notes published by Dr. Meyer as lecturer in Celtic at the University of Illinois. Nearly half the volume (pp. 28-51) is devoted to etymological observations (Sec. VI) and to corrections and emendations in published Irish texts (Sec. VII) and in Thurneysen's *Handbuch des Altirischen* (Sec. VIII). Section VI forms a substantial addition to Dr. Meyer's already extensive contributions to our knowledge of Irish lexicography. Another important division of the brochure deals primarily with questions of meter. In Section III (pp. 14-17) the author establishes the important fact that the Old Irish spirant *th* had been completely aspirated by the tenth century. He also quotes several examples of certain rare variations on the familiar *debide* meter (pp. 15-16), edits critically a didactic poem ascribed to St. Moling (pp. 17-18), and prints

¹ Cf. J. L. Gerig, *Columbia University Quarterly* (December, 1916), pp. 41 f. "The Irish Lives of Guy of Warwick and Bevis of Hampton" (pp. 338), ed. by Professor Robinson, of Harvard, was published in Germany in the *Ztsch. f. celt. Philol.*, VI (1907).

six ancient Irish poems showing sporadic rhyme in addition to the older alliteration (pp. 18-28). One of these he regards, doubtless correctly, as "an originally pagan prayer remodelled by a Christian poet." If this surmise be correct, the document furnishes a startling illustration of the kindly attitude of the early Christian Irish toward their ancient pagan beliefs. Sections I (pp. 9-12) and II (pp. 12-14), to which attention will be drawn immediately, deal with well-known characters in Irish romantic saga.

Section I is of especial importance to those interested in Irish literature either for its own sake or for its possible relations to other European literatures. It consists of a note on Sualtaim, the putative father of the great Cuchulainn. Dr. Meyer points out that the Ulster hero, known to pagan tradition as the son of a supernatural being, Lug (perhaps a god), has been supplied with a mortal father through one of those errors "which abound in Irish as well as in Welsh genealogical tables." The name of Cuchulainn's mortal father is given variously as Soalta, Soa(i)lte, Sualtach, and Sualtaim, of which the latter, although the commonest, is the latest. Just as King Amadair Flidais evolved from a misreading of a *máthair Flidais*, "his mother (was) Flidais," and King Bran mac Febail, familiar to all readers of the *Imram Bran*, originated from a misinterpretation of the name of the promontory called Srúb Brain, "Raven's Beak," as if it were "Bran's Headland,"¹ so the name of Cuchulainn's parent appears to have arisen from a mistranslation of the adjective *soalta* applied to the young hero, as in a passage quoted by Dr. Meyer from the *Book of Leinster*, in which Leborcham, the official woman satirist of the court of Ulster, addresses Cuchulainn as *gein Loga soalta*, "well-nurtured son of Lug." That Cuchulainn's earthly father owes his name to this or a similar error is rendered still more probable by the highly suspicious circumstance that in its earliest form—*Soalta*, *Soailte*—the name is uninflected, as is also the case with the later *Sualtach*, which latter "suggests the meaning 'well-jointed,' while *Sualtaim* may be looked upon as the superlative of *su-alta* [*so-alta*], the genitive having, as often in proper names, taken the place of the nominative." It is worth adding that the invention of a human father for Cuchulainn perhaps explains the fact that in the *Cóir Anmann* Sualtam is called *Sidhe*, "of the elf mound," and is supplied with a supernatural mother: an epithet originally applied to the son has been transferred to the father and the fairy mother invented to account for it.² Dr. Meyer also fails to note the fact that a Sualtach appears as the grandfather of Finn mac Cumail in the *Tesmolta Cormaic*.³

The bearing of these observations on Irish literary history and on the science of storiology, though not touched upon by Dr. Meyer, is important. Students who use Celtic tradition for purposes of literary investigation are liable to disregard the editorial element in recorded Irish tradition, whereas

¹ Cf. *Rom. Rev.*, IX (1918), 39, n. 29.

² *Irische Texte*, III, 1 (1891), 407.

³ *Sil. Gad.*, I (1892), 92; II, 99.

it becomes more and more evident not only that the great mass of ancient Irish saga literature was put into its present form at a period when the events described were thought of as belonging to the remote past, but that the work was accomplished by scholarly redactors who, according to their lights, combined into new and often awkward forms much genuine folk tradition, outlined in sketchy fashion accounts whose details could be filled out according to the fancy of future narrators, unscrupulously devised stories to account for unfamiliar names, or introduced new characters to whom they attached popular motifs or tales of their own devising. With this light one has only to read such documents as the *Dinnshenchas*, the *Cóir Anmann*, and the *Acallam na Senórach* to appreciate how many Irish stories owe their local habitation, if not their very existence, to fanciful learned or semilearned etymologies.

Dr. Meyer's discovery is particularly important in connection with one of our most archaic and puzzling Irish sagas, the *Compert Conchulainn*, "Birth of Cuchulainn." Of the several extant versions of this story the most ancient linguistically occurs in the early twelfth-century *Lebor na h-Uidre*.¹ Zimmer long ago pointed out that the LU version is a clumsy redaction of at least two earlier accounts of the birth of Cuchulainn,² and it now seems clear that at least one of these was itself a combination of still older elements. As Zimmer noted, the portion of the LU text containing the double account of Cuchulainn's divine and his human father is derived ultimately from the *Libur Dromma Snechta*, a lost manuscript which, as Thurneysen has recently shown, probably dated from the eighth century. This confused narrative is comprehensible only as a perversion of a story told in the fifteenth-century MS *Egerton 1782* (B.M.) (*Ir. T.*, I, 143 ff.) and more satisfactorily in the fourteenth-century MS *Stowe D. 4. 2* (R.I.A.) (*CZ*, V [1905], 500 ff.). It is obvious to the student of popular literature that the version given in the Egerton and Stowe manuscripts is based on an account in which Cuchulainn was the son of King Conchobar's sister Deichtire by a supernatural being who abducts his mistress to his fairy realm and, after keeping her for three years, causes her to assume bird form and lure her brother to the other world at the time her child is to be born. In the account represented by LU this clear, simple narrative has been distorted in an unsuccessful effort to combine it with other stories attached to Cuchulainn for the purpose of explaining his extraordinary career. For example, Cuchulainn, like Conchobar himself and other heroes among relatively primitive peoples, is born as the result of his mother's swallowing a diminutive animal which sprang into her mouth from a vessel out of which she was drinking; or he is the offspring of incestuous intercourse between Deichtire and her brother. The stupid

¹ Cf. Thurneysen, *Abhandl. d. königl. Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., N.F., XIV, No. 2 (1912), p. 31.

² Zimmer, *Ztsch. f. vergl. Sprf.*, XXVIII (1887), 423 f.

and well-nigh incomprehensible patchwork resulting from the combination of these three accounts is further complicated by the addition of the story of Cuchulainn's birth as the son of the princess and a petty Ulster chieftain named Sualtair, who, according to an oft-quoted interpolation in the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, lives on the Plain of Muirthemne and from whose dwelling the boy hero Setanta (Cuchulainn), like Perceval, sets forth to seek deeds of arms at his uncle's court.

The story of Cuchulainn's conception through drink is an ethnological motif which obviously embarrassed the redactor of the LU version, and the incest story¹ is suggestive of those late Greek accounts which make Perseus the son of Danaë by her uncle instead of by Zeus. Though these as well as the remaining versions of Cuchulainn's birth-story are at least as old as the eighth century and it is impossible in the present state of our knowledge to determine the exact order in which the various stories became attached to the Ulster cycle, Dr. Meyer's discovery, supported by the independent investigations of the folklorist, furnishes an indication of the relative chronology of at least two of the accounts. Whatever may be the ultimate origin of the strange figure, one of whose names (Setanta) looks so un-Goidelic, the story of his purely mortal origin is probably the latest, and that of his half-divine origin is the most satisfactory and perhaps the most ancient, which has come down to us.² It should, however, be emphasized that the identification of Sualtair as a comparatively late addition to the Cuchulainn saga in no way assists the futile efforts of real or would-be mythologists to identify Cuchulainn with a supposed Gaulish divinity Esus,³ with the sun,⁴ or with an ancient cuckoo-god.⁵ As Windisch has pointed out in an important dissertation,⁶ the attachment to Cuchulainn of various fabulous elements, some of which render him a striking parallel to the Greek Achilles, no more tend to prove his original divinity than, *mutatis mutandis*, they do in the case, say, of Beowulf or of Arthur.

Dr. Meyer's observations, taken in connection with the fact that Welsh as well as Irish mediaeval writers fabricated genealogies and told false etymological legends, lend plausibility to a hypothesis regarding the origin of King Arthur's patronymic which was suggested as early as the beginning of the last century⁷ and has been proposed several times since.⁸ It is based on an

¹ Nutt's arguments for the mythical character of the trait are not convincing (*op. cit.*, II, 44 f.).

² Cf. Nutt's analysis, *op. cit.*, II, 43.

³ D'Arbois de Jubainville, *RC*, XIX, 245 ff.

⁴ Rhys, *Hib. Lects.*, p. 435.

⁵ J. Pokorný, *Mitteil. d. anthrop. Gesell. in Wien*, XXXIX (1909), 80 ff.

⁶ *Abhandl. d. königl. sächsisch. Gesell. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, XXIX (1912), 109, 119 ff.

⁷ Cf. Joseph Ritson, *Life of King Arthur* (1825), pp. 53 ff.

⁸ Cf. Fletcher, *Harvard Studies and Notes*, X (1906), 89.

interpolation in certain late manuscripts of Nennius' *Historia Britonum*, according to which Arthur was called *mab uter Britannice, filius horribilis Latine, quoniam a puericia sua crudelis fuit*. The words *mab uter* are susceptible not only of the interpretation given in the Latin gloss,¹ but also of the translation "son of Uter"—a fact which may have led Geoffrey of Monmouth or one of his predecessors to supply Nennius' lauded *dux bellorum* with a father, and to exalt the latter by applying to him the epithet Pendragon, "Head-dragon," "Head-leader," in accordance with a practice "common in Welsh poetry of calling a king or great leader a dragon."² Merlin is brought forward to assist the newly created Uter Pendragon in playing Jupiter to Igera's Alceme, and thus the father of the renowned Arthur enters the theater of mediaeval romance as the result of a linguistic perversion strikingly similar to that which gave rise to the father of the Ulster hero whose birth, training, and early exploits so closely resemble those of Hercules.³

The question of whether Arthur's father was invented by Geoffrey or someone else and of whether the falsification was deliberate or unintentional cannot, of course, be answered with certainty, but a twelfth-century Irish poem⁴ attacking the learned, who "for the sake of pelf" confound genealogical tables, is certainly eloquent of the methods in vogue in Ireland, whose relations with Wales are so amply attested on both sides of St. George's Channel.

Dr. Meyer's second note contributes an additional bit to the already large body of evidence tending to discredit Zimmer's brilliant though often unsound arguments in favor of Germanic influences on Irish tradition. Taking up the work begun by Windisch, the author completely demolishes Zimmer's contention that Fer Diad, Cuchulainn's friend and most famous opponent in the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, is a combination of Siegfried and a Nibelung. Fer Diad's famous *conganchness*, unlike Siegfried's horny skin, was a kind of armament, and the name signifies "Man of Smoke," not "Man of Mist," as Zimmer imagined. "It is evidently a nickname denoting perhaps a man with a smoke-colored complexion or hair, or referring to some accident at his birth, or the like." Zimmer's tendency to overestimate the classical influences on mediaeval Irish literature⁵ has also been recently pointed out by Professor W. F. Thrall.⁶

TOM PEETE CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ Cf. word *uthr* in Pughe's *Welsh Dictionary*.

² Rhys, *Celtic Brit.* (1904), p. 136; cf. *Welsh People*, p. 106.

³ Of the name *Uther pendragon* Zimmer says, "Dies will doch . . . weiter nichts sagen als *Uther* (=latein *Victor*?) *dux bellorum*." Nen. *Vindic.*, p. 286, note.

⁴ *Misc. Hib.*, p. 9.

⁵ *Ztsch. f. d. Alt.*, XXXIII (1889), 129 ff., 257 ff.

⁶ *Mod. Phil.*, XV (1917), 449 ff.

L'Année Littéraire (1754-1790) comme intermédiaire en France des littératures étrangères, par P. VAN TIEGHEM. (Bibliothèque de littérature comparée.) Paris: F. Rieder et C^{ie}, 1917. Pp. 162.

According to Dr. Van Tieghem, this study "est destiné à faire connaître avec quelque précision le rôle qu'a joué le journal *L'Année Littéraire* dans la diffusion en France des littératures étrangères pendant la seconde moitié du XVIII^e siècle. Il se compose d'un Mémoire et d'un Index analytique."

The Mémoire is a study of the general characteristics of the *Année*. The value of the journal as a literary review is stressed, and tables are given showing the relative importance of the various foreign literatures and genres and the rise and fall of the number of contributions concerning foreign literatures. The attitude of the *Année* toward translations is discussed at length. The Mémoire contains a chapter explaining the ideas of Fréron and his followers as to the advantages and dangers of this foreign invasion. Dr. Van Tieghem also analyzes the aesthetic theory of the *Année* and gives its judgments on the principal foreign literatures as a whole and on certain foreign authors (Shakespeare, Young, Lessing, Goethe, and others) in particular. As a whole the Mémoire constitutes a very satisfactory chapter in the history of French literature.

The Index analytique professes to give "l'indication de tous les comptes-rendus ou annonces d'ouvrages étrangers, ou traduits des langues étrangères, ou se rapportant aux littératures étrangères, à l'exception de quelques ouvrages purement scientifiques et d'un certain nombre de grammaires." The incompleteness of Dr. Van Tieghem's list is revealed by an examination of the *Année* for two important years.

For the year 1769—"l'année la plus féconde"—the *Année* contains ten notices not mentioned in Dr. Van Tieghem's list of thirty-seven.

ENGLAND

1. *Seconde lettre de M. J. Blunt à l'auteur de ces feuilles*. Blunt maintains that Barthe, author of *Les fausses infidélités*, took both *sujet* and *fond* from *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.¹ (The first letter is listed by Dr. Van Tieghem in No. 71.)

2. *Vies des Pères, des Martyrs et des autres principaux Saints*. Translated from the English (Vol. 6).² Summary of several of the lives. Book highly praised.

3. *Parallèle de la condition et des facultés de l'homme avec la condition et les facultés des autres animaux*. Translated from the English by Robinet.³ (English author not named.) Man surpasses other animals through his reason, his sociability, his taste, and his religion. Each of these four is discussed in turn. The work is cited as well worth reading.

¹ *Année*, II (1769), 110-17. ² *Année*, II (1769), 103-16. ³ *Année*, V (1769), 97-112.

4. *L'Observateur français à Londres*, Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5.¹ Discussion of the English government.

5. *Ibid.*, Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.² The English *mores*. Frequent suicides among the English, their strong sense of justice, enthusiasm for athletics. (The first volume of *L'Observateur* is noted by Dr. Van Tieghem in No. 224.)

GERMANY

6. *Essai d'une description générale des peuples policés et des peuples non-policés*. Translated from the German of M. Steeb.³ A sketch of the history of civilization. "La raison la plus saine et la plus lumineuse a dicté cet ouvrage."

7. *Histoire de la Russie*. Translated from the German.⁴ The German text is a translation of a Russian original by Lomonossow. Mildly praised.

8. *Mort de Gellert*.⁵ Announcement of his death, with an appreciation of the man.

OTHER COUNTRIES

9. *Zend Avesta*. Translated into French from the original *Zend*, with remarks.⁶ Announcement and short review.

10. *Kongs-Skugg-Sio, utlegd a Daunsku og Latinu, or Speculum Regale cum interpretatione Danicâ et Latinâ, variis lectionibus et notis*. Reviewed in a letter from Copenhagen.⁷ This work was written by a Norwegian royal minister for the instruction of his son. It is said to date from the twelfth century. It treats of the manner of life of the business men, of the court, of the clergy, and of the peasants.

For 1784—the year of the appearance of Volumes XIX and XX of Le Tourneur's translation of Shakespeare—Dr. Van Tieghem lists ten articles. Two omissions are to be noted:

1. *Evelina*, by Miss Burney. Translated from the English.⁸ Announcement only.

2. *Histoire des progrès et de la chute de la République Romaine*, by Adam Ferguson. Translated from the English.⁹ Useful but not remarkable for style or breadth of view.

If these two years are a fair test of the *Index*, one must conclude that the omissions are so numerous and significant that they very seriously impair its value. It is to be regretted that Dr. Van Tieghem in this part of his study does not reach the standard set by him in his monumental *Ossian en France*.

JAMES KESSLER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ *Année*, VI (1769), 314–26.² *Année*, VIII (1769), 264–76.³ *Année*, III (1769), 3–20.⁴ *Année*, V (1769), 325–43.⁵ *Année*, VIII (1769), 350–51.⁶ *Année*, VI (1769), 91–97.⁷ *Année*, VII (1769), 346–50.⁸ *Année*, III (1784), 143.⁹ *Année*, VI (1784), 145–62.

of

les
es.
4.)

on-
he
été

an
ed.
on

th

le
ed
al
th
t,

e
s.

e-

n
or

e
ir
is
n